NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

NO. DCLVIII.

SEPTEMBER, 1910.

# A PLEA FOR CONSERVATION OF COMMON SENSE.

THE greatest Senator of his time or of any time in the history of this Republic rose slowly and somewhat heavily to his feet and addressed the presiding officer. Not a chair upon the floor was vacant. The gallery was filled. The speaker was in the prime of his intellectual vigor and at the zenith of his fame. The subject was one which now, though paramount in importance, would be considered dull. It was the Value of Credit. Economists had apostrophized it, philosophers had analyzed it, agitators had derided it. But now a statesman of the widest vision, incited by ardent desire to augment the stability of American institutions, was to expatiate upon it and to exemplify it from a wealth of knowledge and imagery. He yet recalled the time when, in "an exulting speech," he had spoken of his country as "consisting of nine millions of people." He could hardly persuade himself that within the short time which had elapsed since that epoch our population had doubled. He knew no imagination fertile enough to depict the progress of wealth and population in the half-century to come. There was, then, the greater need of laying firm the foundations of material advancement, to the end that succeeding generations should not suffer from the short-sightedness or laxity of their progenitors.

What, then, was credit? To his mind, the link connecting

Copyright, 1910, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labor and Capital, "not as the refuge of the prodigal and the reckless; not as gratifying present wants with the certainty of future absolute ruin; but as the genius of honorable trust and confidence; as the blessing voluntarily offered to good character and to good conduct; as the beneficent agent which assists honesty and enterprise in obtaining comfort and independence."

Taken away, what would remain? Not to the few, but to the many? What for labor and industry but mere manual toil and daily drudgery? If capital be withdrawn from active employment, does not the rate of wages diminish? When credit shall be abolished and labor be divorced from capital, will not capital be hoarded and labor starve?

"The general doctrine of political economy," continued the speaker slowly and without emphasis,

"is, that wealth consists in whatever is useful or convenient to man, and that labor is the producing cause of all this wealth. This is very true. But, then, what is labor? In the sense of political writers, and in common language, it means human industry; in a philosophical view, it may receive a much more comprehensive meaning. It is not, in that view, human toil only, the mere action of thews and muscles; but it is any active agency which, working upon the materials with which the world is supplied, brings forth products useful or convenient to man. The materials of wealth are in the earth, in the seas and in their natural and unaided productions. Labor obtains these materials, works upon them and fashions them to human use. Now it has been the object of scientific art, or of the application of science to art, to increase this active agency, to augment its power, by creating millions of laborers in the form of machines all but automatic, all to be diligently employed and kept at work by the force of natural powers. To this end these natural powers, principally those of steam and falling water, are subsidized and taken into human employment. Spinning-machines, power looms and all the mechanical devices, acting, among other operatives, in the factories and workshops, are but so many laborers. They are usually denominated labor-*saving* machines, but it would be more just to call them labor-*doing* machines. They are made to be active agents; to have motion, and to produce effect; and though without intelligence, they are guided by laws of science which are exact and perfect, and they produce results, therefore, in general, more accurate than the human hand is capable of producing. When we look upon one of these, we behold a mute fellow laborer, of immense power, of mathematical exactness, and of ever-during and unwearied effort. And while he is thus a most skilful and productive laborer, he is a non-consumer, at least beyond the wants of his mechanical being. . . . It is these automatic allies and co-operators, and these powers of Nature, thus employed and placed under human direction, which have come, with such prodigious effect,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to man's aid, in the great business of procuring the means of living, of comfort and of wealth, and which have so swollen the products of her skilful industry."

The speaker paused. He had enunciated his hypothesis with notable lucidity. Results were yet to be reckoned with. He asked his hearers to look at the statistics and see the effect of labor, united with and acting upon capital. He asked them to look yet again and behold credit, mutual trust, prompt and punctual dealings, and commercial confidence intermingled as indispensable elements in the general system. "Look yet once more," he added with greater emphasis, "and you will perceive that general competence, great equality in human condition, a degree of popular knowledge and intelligence nowhere surpassed, if anywhere equalled, the prevalence of good moral sentiment and extraordinary prosperity are the result of the whole." Such he declared to be the state of things actually existing in the country.

Then the statesman became the orator. His voice rose in indignant rebuke, quivered in impassioned utterance.

"And yet," he thundered, scornfully, "there are persons who constantly clamor. They complain of oppression, speculation, and the pernicious influence of accumulated wealth. They cry out loudly against all banks and corporations, and all the means by which small capitals become united, in order to produce important and beneficial results. They carry on a mad hostility against all established institutions. They would choke up the fountains of industry, and dry all its streams.

"In a country of unbounded liberty, they clamor against oppression. In a country of perfect equality, they would move heaven and earth against privilege and monopoly. In a country where property is more equally divided than anywhere else, they rend the air with the shouting of agrarian doctrines. In a country where the wages of labor are high beyond all parallel, they would teach the laborer that he is but an oppressed slave. Sir, what can such men want? What do they mean? They can want nothing, sir, but to enjoy the fruits of other men's labor. They can mean nothing but disturbance and disorder, the diffusion of corrupt principles, and the destruction of the moral sentiments and moral habits of society. A licentiousness of feeling and of action is sometimes produced by prosperity itself. Men cannot always resist the temptation to which they are exposed by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

very abundance of the bounties of Providence, and the very happiness of their own condition."

So spoke Daniel Webster in the Senate of the United States seventy-eight years ago. True words they doubtless were then; true words they surely would be, if uttered, now. Unquestionably a spirit of unrest dominates the land. But, if it be true that fundamentally the condition of the country is sound, must we necessarily succumb to despondency, abandon effort looking to retrieval and cringe like cravens before clouds that only threaten? Rather ought not we to analyze conditions, search for causes, find the root of the distress, which even now exists only in men's minds, and then, after the American fashion, apply such remedies as seem most likely to produce beneficent results?

What, then, is the matter with the United States? The government still lives and is well administered. The Constitution continues to be upheld by our chief tribunal as the bulwark of human liberties. Freedom of worship of God and freedom of schools for succeeding generations are inviolate still. Poverty is rare. Physical suffering that could possibly be alleviated by action of the State is not observable. Never before in the history of the world has so great a nation or our nation been so signally blessed with respect to all things that subserve the happiness, the contentment and the opportunity of its citizens. And yet it is true that for the time the business of a mighty commercial country is, in a comparative sense, at a standstill, development of natural resources has practically ceased, essential confidence among groups or classes is seriously impaired, and the very air is laden with apprehension of startling and grievous happenings.

Why? What are the bases of these strange forebodings? About what conceptions, real or imaginary, gather the clouds of distrust and anxiety? The tangible fears may be summarized briefly as follows:

(1) Apprehension of war.
(2) Oppression of the poor by the rich.
(3) The tariff and the trusts.
(4) Common extravagance.
(5) The disestablishment of credit.
(6) Effects of popular agitation.
(7) The undermining of our political institutions.

A notable array surely! One, too, if founded upon reality, sufficient to give rise to solicitude. But is there anything that is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new or strange to our country or to any country from the beginning of history? Take the causes of disquietude as enumerated.

(1) Apprehension of War.

Herein we find nothing unprecedented. We have had not only anticipations of wars, but wars themselves, from the day when the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock. The Republic was born of strife and was christened in the ashes of conflict. Itself was welded together as a Nation by the most interneciary struggle the world has ever beheld. But recently a once great foreign Power made itself the laughing-stock of the world by testing its decayed prowess against this Titan among nations. What ensued in each and every case? Only a tightening of the bonds of unity; only a quickening and strengthening of patriotic impulse. The wheels of progress were never clogged, hardly impeded. Why, then, borrow trouble now? Is the Nation less able to withstand the impact of a blow to-day than at any time since it sprang into being? And what are the tokens of danger? Universally, war with Great Britain is regarded as impossible, with France as a negligible consideration, with Germany, a sane and practical commonwealth, as an idle fancy, with Russia as a contingency too remote even for use in fiction.

Remains Japan. At regular intervals fervid imaginations conjure up the spectre of the East. But thoughtful minds inquire: What could our neighbor hope to gain from a success which, at best, could be but temporary? Prestige? Glory? These she has, if not in abundance, at least in adequacy. Additional territory or material possessions which she could not hope to retain? Then the Japanese are fools. Have they indicated as much? Rather have not they demonstrated by every word and deed a capacity of judgment, even of forbearance, such as would reflect credit upon the most sober of Anglo-Saxons? Wanton assaults are not often adventured by the less strong upon the obviously unconquerable unless they be insane. And Japan is not a madhouse. Nor are Japan's statesmen unaware of the fact that the chief hope of every European nation is to find an opportunity to become an ally of the United States. They know full well, though some of our own amateur alarmists may not, that Britain, of all Powers, would never open such a door to dreaded Germany by lending aid to a declared foe of America. War itself,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when forced upon us, we have always been able to engage in and emerge from without discredit. Apprehension of war at a time like this, when civilization is moving steadily towards establishment of peace throughout the world, is no more than an anachronistic bugaboo. So long as the Union continues to be a union in fact as well as in name and maintains its traditional policy of non-interference in the affairs of others it will be immune to plagues from without. Our real perils are only those which spring from within.

(2) Oppression of the poor by the rich.
(3) The tariff and the trusts.

The two, in the public mind, are intertwined and should be. There is no direct oppression of the poor by the rich. For the first time in the progress of civilization this can be said with truth. History from the beginning of governments to the beginning of the Republic is a seamy record of tyranny of the strong, the rich, the powerful. To this day, in nearly all lands except our own, real dominance is exercised openly by a class. In Russia autocracy still rules; in Germany monarchy "bequeathed by God" still has the final word; in Italy, the nobility; in England, the aristocracy; in Spain, but yesterday, the Church; even in France, clearly a class, the socialists, hold the balance of power. Here we find no such ascendancy. The individual is still his own master at the polls and in his home. Serfdom is no more. Personal service is not synonymous with political servitude. Ours is still the land of the free; and whatever differences exist respecting the powers of governance relate chiefly, on the one hand, to restriction of suffrage and, on the other, to the elimination of sex qualification. Neither project involves revolution. Each seeks consideration upon the ground of policy, despite the insistence, in the second instance, of inherent right. Could the Fathers have been assured of so happy a condition among ninety millions of people, can we doubt that they would have felt far more confident than they did feel that the foundations they were laying with such care and foresight as were within their power to exercise would prove indeed everlasting? Assuredly there is no visible breach in the wall of government of and by the people.

But we are told that a privileged class has grown up under the rose, that mere wealth wields undue influence in legislation, that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the few fatten upon the many, that monopoly safeguarded by law holds individualism in check, that excessive tariffs no longer tend to develop industries, but are become no more or less than evasive taxes, that obnoxious and detrimental Trusts thrive upon advantages thereby obtained. Undoubtedly, to a great extent, these assertions are true. But, in the light of history, was it not inevitable that a period of amazing development should be dappled by such accompaniments? All great forward movements have been attended by corresponding ills. But because a child has the measles the parent does not kill the child. He seeks to eradicate the disease by the use of remedies suggested by others more experienced than himself, in whose fidelity and judgment he reposes faith. But in him, the parent, lies the authority and responsibility of discriminating between the physician and the quack.

So it is with the American people to-day. As we have seen, they still have the power. Theirs also is the responsibility. Are signs visible that they are evading it? Rather the reverse. Neither of the great political parties is unified in proposing remedies. One apparently is rent in twain. But in that fact lies no cause of alarm. The true significance is to the highest degree encouraging. That great problems cannot be resolved in a day, a month or a year, is a patent truth that demands recognition. But vastly more important is the certainty that, in this country, they cannot be resolved at all except through the application of the best intelligence of all the people.

Hence the hopefulness in the obvious awakening of minds throughout the land. Already we perceive a growing demand for more competent representation in Congress, for higher standards of fitness in all public officials, for closer attention to public duties, for greater efficiency in every direction. This can only mean that acts of those in temporary authority will be more sharply scrutinized and that the people themselves, in order to pass discerning criticism, will attain better understanding. Surely, when we consider further that independence and fairness of judgment are the offspring, if not, indeed, essential concomitants, of intelligence, we can find in this arousal no cause of misgiving; rather, springs of hope and faith in all that pertains to progress and civilization.

(4) Common extravagance.

Profligacy caused the downfall of the Roman Empire. Pru-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dence builded England. And we of America are of Angle, not of Latin, stock. By inheritance, then, we are provident as well as thrifty. Our ancestors surely were. To their minds waste was a crime. Frugality was a cardinal principle of their living, but not from choice; from necessity. Had they possessed the means of providing comforts for their families such as now exist, is there reason to doubt that those resources would have been utilized, and to advantage? Moreover, is it not a fact that the luxuries of one epoch become positive requirements of another? Money expended in safeguarding health and strengthening the body is not wasted. Good roads constitute investment, not dissipation. The telephone is not a worthless toy. The motor-car is more than a mere vehicle of pleasure. Both are savers of time and doers of labor. Each, too, serves a highly desirable purpose in facilitating that intercourse among individuals which tends to strengthen a community by gratifying gregarious instincts.

Public extravagance? Yes. Governments in recent years have displayed woful disregard of pecuniary responsibility. But is this tendency, however lamentable, more than a phase of rapid growth? And if it be true that the people are becoming so fully awakened to conditions that, in some sections, they regard even the tariff, which is only a tax, as a moral issue, is there not evidence that the phase is passing? The present National Administration is bending its best energies to effect economies. The chief battle-cry of the opposition is Retrenchment. What can this mean if not recognition of the ebbing of the tide of prodigality? Are not such symptoms favorable and full of pleasing expectancy?

(5) The Disestablishment of Credit.

Here we find the most obvious cause of prevailing depression. The link that connects Labor with Capital is not broken, but we may not deny that it is less cohesive than it should be or than conditions warrant. Financially, the country is stronger than ever before in its history. Recovery from a panic so severe as that of three years ago was never before so prompt and comparatively complete. The masses are practically free from debt. Money is held by the banks in abundance and rates are low. And our currency is sound as gold because gold is its basis.

Why, then, does Capital pause upon the threshold of investment? The answer we believe to be plain. It awaits adjustment of the relations of government to business. Such, at any rate,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is the plea, and pressure is constantly brought to bear upon executives and courts to make haste—haste which, in our judgment, would result in less speed. Great complications growing out of mightily changed conditions call for the most serious consideration. To settle a grave question offhand is only to invite disaster. Better not settle it at all until a reasonable certainty can be felt that it can be settled right. Stability is ever Capital's primary requirement. But the adjustment which it now demands cannot be effected in a month or a year and never can or should be complete. Elasticity is the prime requisite of changes essential to development.

But Capital is notoriously timid. In the present instance, too, it is absurdly foolish. No decision of any court can permanently impair any so-called vested interest. Confiscation is undreamed of, as compared with only a few years ago. The disintegration of properties does not involve their destruction. Moreover, the sharp revolt against all combinations—those that achieve great good, no less than those that work injury—is clearly yielding to study and reason. No sane person now maintains that business —especially manufacturing—can or should be done as it was done half a century ago. In a broad sense, the day of the individual competitor is past, but the opportunity of the individual remains even wider within the corporation. The sole problem consists of determining how government can maintain an even balance between aggregations of interests, on the one hand, and the whole people, on the other, protecting the latter against extortion and saving the former from mad assaults.

The solution is not easy to find for the simple reason that the situation is without precedent. But is not progress being made along sane and cautious lines? But a few years ago the country seemed to be upon the verge of a veritable obsession for government ownership. One political party officially advocated the purchase of coal-mines by the nation. Another demanded that cities acquire all public utilities. Not so now! Acquaintance with the experience of other countries and reflection upon conditions within our own have convinced a great majority of citizens that, while government should and must regulate, it should not and must not own and manage; that while the corporation must not be permitted to dominate and use the State, the State itself must not impair efficiency by possessing the cor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poration. This we believe to be the crux of American sentiment to-day. It only remains to effect such regulation by law, by fixed and definite rule, instead of by officials holding the power of favor and discrimination.

Surely no menace to property or to human rights lies in the striving for such a solution. Both will be safeguarded by its certain finding.

(6) Effects of Popular Agitation.

There was unwarrantable clamor in Webster's time. There was before. There has been since. There will be always. But is there more than common to-day? Contrast the situation with that of recent years. How long is it since the country was infested with tramps, since an army of malcontents marched under the red banner from Ohio to Washington, since baneful strikes prevailed in industrial centres, since railways were tied up, property was being destroyed and homes rendered desolate, since ghastly religious intolerance portended the clash of arms, since even the spectre of polygamy threatened the peace of the Nation?

To appreciate our blessings of the present, we must recall the perils of the past. And is it not a fact that those which seemed at the time most ominous have disappeared like mists from the face of the sea? Already profit-sharing, through stock ownership, bids fair to identify the interests of labor and capital and solve the problem that has vexed all industrial countries for ages. Demagogues in public office no longer derive political advantage from permitting riot to supplant order. Incendiary talk has subsided without impairing freedom of speech. Polygamy is a relic of the past. Slowly but surely all Christianizing influences are coming to unite in common endeavor.

Agitation we still have, but it is agitation of another sort. Turbulent Kansas is no longer a hotbed of ignorant and blatant populism, but has become the seat of intelligent insurgency. Throughout the entire West unreasoning clamor has been superseded by enlightened resolution. And the splendid Southland has already risen, like Phœnix, from the ashes of despair, to the heights of peace and prosperity. Never in the history of the Republic has there been a time when so few vapors clouded the skies. May we not, then, with reason, anticipate fair weather?

(7) The undermining of our political institutions.

But a few years ago a craze for segregation and centralization

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of political authority took possession of many minds. The attack was poignant, but not perennial. No longer is heard a single complaint of encroachment by one branch of the Government upon the prerogatives of another. The machinery of state, so delicately and so sagaciously adjusted under the Constitution, runs without friction, wholly at all times within the control of the people if they but exercise their franchise. And is it not a circumstance most fortuitous, a veritable blessing from Heaven, that at this time when our court of last resort, the final arbiter of all vital disputes, is being virtually reconstituted, we have in the appointive seat a great and sober judge, jealous of the honor of his profession, keen in discriminating between intellectual, judicial and individual capacities and consecrated to the fundamental truth that this is and must continue to be a Government of laws and not of men?

Shortly before he died Professor Sumner, the famous educator and great philosopher of Yale, predicted the downfall of the Republic before the year 1950. Such a prophecy from such a source cannot pass unheeded. But it is not new. Macaulay and Carlyle had similar visions. Theirs, moreover, beheld at a time when the nation seemed likely to break in twain, possessed a semblance of reality springing from accurate perception. Can we say the like of Sumner's? Is not the present, as we have seen, exceptionally secure? What, then, of preparations for the future? Patriotism is the basis of our institutions. And patriotism in the minds of our youth is no longer linked solely with fireworks and deeds of daring. It is taught in our schools. A new course has been added—a course in loyalty. Methodically, our children learn how to vote, how to conduct primaries, conventions and elections, how to discriminate between qualifications of candidates and, finally, how to govern as well as serve. They are taught to despise bribery and all forms of corruption and fraud as treason. Their creed, which they are made to know by heart, is not complex. It is simple but comprehensive, no less beautiful in diction than lofty in aspiration. These are the pledges which are graven upon their memories:

"As it is cowardly for a soldier to run away from the battle, so it is cowardly for any citizen not to contribute his share to the well-being of his country. America is my own dear land; she nourishes me, and I will love her and do my duty to her, whose child, servant and civil soldier I am.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"As the health and happiness of my body depend upon each muscle and nerve and drop of blood doing its work in its place, so the health and happiness of my country depend upon each citizen doing his work in his place."

These young citizens are our hostages to fortune. Can we not safely assume that the principles animating their lives augur well for the permanency of the Republic? When before have the foundation stones of continuance been laid with such care and promise of durability?

The future, then, is bright. And the present? But one thing is needful. No present movement is more laudable than that which looks to conservation of natural resources. But let us never forget that the greatest inherent resource of the American people is common sense. Let that be conserved and applied without cessation, and soon it will be found that all the ills of which we complain but know not of are only such as attend upon the growing pains of a great and blessed country!

THE EDITOR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THE UNITED STATES PEACE COMMISSION.

BY HAMILTON HOLT.

On March 30th, 1910, the Hon. William S. Bennet, of New York, introduced into the House of Representatives the following joint resolution:

"Resolved: that the President of the United States be respectfully requested to consider the expediency of calling an international conference for the purpose of considering the possibility of limiting the armament of the nations of the world by international agreement."

Six days later the Hon. Richard Bartholdt introduced a resolution of much broader scope, whose purpose, as stated in its title, was "to authorize the appointment of a Commission to draft articles of international federation." The duties of the Commission, which was to consist of five members, were as follows:

"*1st.* To urge upon the attention of other governments the fact that relief from the heavy burden of military expenditures and from the disasters of war can best be obtained by the establishment of an international federation.

"*2nd.* To report to Congress, as soon as practicable, a draft of articles of a federation limited to the maintenance of peace, through the establishment of an international court having power to determine by decree all controversies between nations, and to enforce execution of its decrees by the arms of the federation, such arms to be provided to the federation and controlled solely by it.

"*3rd.* To consider and report upon any other means to diminish the expenditures of government for military purposes and to lessen the probabilities of war."

Though Mr. Bartholdt had himself introduced similar bills into previous Congresses, and John H. Small on March 18th, 1908, had presented to the House a memorial from the North Carolina Peace Society proposing the appointment of a Peace Commission, the present Bartholdt bill was conceived and drafted by the World Federation League (now the World Federation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Committee of the New York Peace Society). Some peace advocates were sceptical, but the bill was speedily endorsed by the International School of Peace of Boston and the New England Arbitration and Peace Congress held at Hartford, Connecticut, on May 11th, 1910. A distinguished delegation went to Washington to appear in its behalf before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Their addresses can be found in the pamphlet "International Federation for the Maintenance of Peace," House Committee on Foreign Affairs, May 7th, 1910. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, however, took the best ideas from the Bennet and Bartholdt resolutions and embodied them in a new bill under Mr. Bennet's name. This they reported back favorably to the House, which passed it unanimously on June 10th. On June 24th the Senate concurred. The bill was thereupon signed by the President and is now law. Its full text is as follows:

"Resolved etc.: That a Commission of five members be appointed by the President of the United States to consider the expediency of utilizing existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armaments of the nations of the world by international agreement, and of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace, and to consider and report upon any other means to diminish the expenditures of government for military purposes and to lessen the probabilities of war.

"*Provided*, that the total expenses authorized by the joint resolution shall not exceed the sum of $10,000 and that the Commission shall be required to make its final report within two years from the date of the passage of this resolution."

A careful reading of this bill discloses the fact that it is in its essential nature a measure to bring about a world federation limited to the maintenance of peace. Thus the United States announces to the world that she is ready to champion this idea in the council of nations. For the first time in the annals of history a great people have officially recognized that the true philosophy of the Peace Movement requires a world federation as the prerequisite of universal peace.

Henry IV of France was probably the first lawgiver to have a glimmer of this peace philosophy when he conceived his "Great Design" at the end of the sixteenth century. Other statesmen have also dreamed of universal Peace through federation, while many of the prophets and philosophers and most of the poets from Dante to Longfellow have seen the vision. Perhaps no one has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more clearly perceived the manifold implications of this philosophy than Emanuel Kant. In his famous essay, "Perpetual Peace," published in 1795, he declared that we can never have universal peace until the world is politically organized, and it will never be possible to organize the world politically until the majority of the nations have a representative form of government. At last all the peoples of the world have achieved in some measure representative government. Russia has its Duma; China has announced that shortly it will promulgate a constitution; while Turkey and Persia have each just gone through the throes of revolution and emerged with a vigorous parliament. If Kant's philosophy is sound, the world is at last ready for world organization and universal peace.

The only two powers that ever have or ever can govern human beings are force and reason—war and law. If we do not have one we must have the other. The problem before the world is how to decrease the area of war and increase the area of law until war vanishes and law envelops the world. At the present moment the world is organized into fifty-nine nations claiming independence, and within their territories—nominally at least—organization, law and peace prevail. We have already learned to substitute law for war in hamlets, towns, cities, provinces, states and even up to the fifty-nine nations; but in that international realm over and above each nation in which each nation is equally sovereign, the only way at the present moment for a nation to secure its rights is by the use of force. Force, therefore, or war, as it is called when exerted by a nation against another nation, is at present the only legal and final method of settling international differences. In other words, the nations are to-day in that stage of civilization where without a qualm they claim the right to settle their disputes in a manner which they would put their own subjects to death for imitating. The Peace Movement, therefore, is nothing but the process of substituting law for war.

But how can we best establish law in the international realm? Certainly not by the cumbrous methods of the present. To-day there is no such thing as a code of international law which is binding on the nations. What passes under the name of international law is simply a series of arguments, maxims, precedents and opinions. It is the work, not of legislators, but of scholars.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The nations are at perfect liberty to accept it or reject it, as they wish. Before we can have a real international law we must have behind it some conscious political organization to give it sanction and validity, and that implies a federation of the world.

The history of international law presents striking analogies to the history of private law, just as the history of international war does to private war. Professor T. J. Lawrence, in his essay "The Evolution of Peace," distinguishes these four stages in the evolution of private war:

> "(1) Kinship is the sole bond; revenge and retaliation are unchecked, there being no authority whatever. (2) Organization is found an advantage and tribes under a chief subdue undisciplined hordes. The right of private vengeance within the tribe is regulated, but not forbidden. (3) Courts of Justice exist side by side with a limited right of vengeance. (4) Private war is entirely abolished, all disputes being settled by the courts."

Professor H. Stanley Jevons, who thus summarizes Lawrence, adds: "In international relations we are entering in the third stage." International law, therefore, is in the same state of development as private law of about the tenth century.

Likewise the history of the organization of the "United Nations" which is to give the sanction to international law will correspond to the history of the organization of the thirteen American Colonies into the United States. The "United Nations," however, has already reached the same stage of development as the American Colonies at the time of their first confederation.

The organization of the world has therefore begun. The first official step was taken in 1888 when James B. McCreary introduced a bill into the United States Congress establishing the Pan-American Conferences. These Conferences are the legislative branch of the Pan-American Federation of Republics. The germs of the Pan-American executive can be seen in the Bureau of the American Republics at Washington, D. C., though a distinct Pan-American Court is not yet in evidence.

The second step in world organization was the birth of the Interparliamentary Union at Paris, in the following year, due largely to the efforts of the English carpenter, William Randal Cremer, since crowned with the Nobel Peace Prize. The Interparliamentary Union is the germ of the federation of the parlia-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments of the world. To its action is largely due the calling of the First Hague Conference by the Tsar of Russia and the Second Hague Conference by President Roosevelt. Some have seen in the Interparliamentary Union the germ of the Lower House of the World Parliament, the Hague Conferences being the germ of the Upper House.

The establishment of the Hague Conferences, however, is by far the most important step ever taken towards peace through world organization. No wonder the first Conference has been called the Magna Charta of International Law. In the Hague Court and the recurring Hague Conferences we see the germs of the international court and the parliament of man. The problem is how to develop these so that they will become the judicial and legislative departments of a powerful world constitution. The creation of the executive department of the "United Nations," though still in embryo, is contemplated in the clause of the Bennet joint resolution requiring the Peace Commission to consider "constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace."

Now what can the Peace Commission do? It cannot treat officially with foreign Governments, for it has no diplomatic status. That is as it should be. It would be extremely unwise for it to usurp in any way the functions of the American delegation to the Third Hague Conference. It would seem to be an established fact that all advances toward peace through international law are to be effectuated hereafter at the recurring Hague Conferences. The eight years' interval that elapses between them is none too long for a world public sentiment to ripen and crystallize. As Senator Root has well said:

> "The world has entered upon an orderly process through which, step by step, in successive conferences, each taking the work of its predecessor as its point of departure, there may be continual progress towards making the practice of civilized nations conform to their peaceful professions."

When the present writer attended the Second Hague Conference in the summer of 1907, it was quite obvious that the chief trouble with that Conference was the fact that the delegates came there more or less unprepared. When resolutions were "sprung" on them they did not know just what to do. They had to report back to their Governments, but the Governments, not being on



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the spot, were hesitant how to instruct them. Thus a great deal of time was lost and much was left undone that could otherwise have been done. The only nation that came to the Second Hague Conference thoroughly prepared was Germany. Her delegation devoted the whole winter before the Conference assembled to a thorough study of the questions to be brought before it. On many subjects she was the chief obstacle to progress there, but the thoroughness of her preparation enabled her to exert a greater influence on the results of the Conference than the inherent merits of her proposals justified. Our Government, therefore, will have at its service a Commission who will have devoted all their talents to mastering the greatest issue now before the world. The State Department, with its manifold duties, has neither the time nor equipment to compass the work. The delegates to the Third Hague Conference will be appointed only a few months before they go to Holland. They will have no time to work out any scheme of world federation. Upon the Peace Commission, therefore, will devolve the duty of pointing out how the United States can take the lead in this movement. Its report will enable our delegation to the Third Hague Conference to secure the greatest possible results in that most august world assembly. Surely no greater or nobler opportunity has ever come to five statesmen to serve humanity.

Now what are the problems that must come before the Commission? The joint resolution that brought it into being requires it to consider these three questions:

1. The limitation of armaments by international agreement.
2. The possibility of combining the navies of the world for peace.
3. Any other methods to bring about peace.

Let us take up each of these in order.

When the Tsar of Russia called the First Hague Conference of 1899 his fondest hope was that the burdens of overgrowing and ever-growing armaments that were impoverishing the peoples of the world might in some way be taken off their backs. He did not see that disarmament cannot take place until the world is politically organized and that it is just as absurd for nations to disarm before the existence of international courts, parliaments and executives as it would be for cowboys to discard their pistols before there are sheriffs and justices of the peace. The First Hague Conference started in bravely enough and assigned

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the question of the limitation of armaments to one of its most important committees. It was the "frontispiece" of the Circular of the Russian Government, and the Russian delegation strained every nerve to have the Conference take some action in the matter. Colonel Gilinsky, who had charge of the question, prefaced the introduction of his proposals with these words:

"Will the peoples represented in this Conference be entirely satisfied, if, in going hence, we take them arbitration and the laws of warfare, but nothing for times of peace,—of this *armed* peace which is so heavy a burden on the nations, which crushes them to that point where it can be sometimes said that open war would perhaps be better than this state of secret war, this incessant competition in which all the world pushes forward larger and larger armies—larger now in time of peace than they used to be in times of greatest warfare? The various countries have engaged in war only once in every twenty or thirty years; but this armed peace lasts for decades, it precedes war and follows it."

Despite all of Russia's efforts to the contrary, the Committee which had the matter in charge made the following report:

"The members of the committee charged with the examination of the propositions of Colonel Gilinsky, relating to the first topic of Count Mouravieff's circular, have met twice. With the exception of Colonel Gilinsky, they have decided unanimously: first, that it would be very difficult to fix, even for a term of five years, the number of troops, without regulating at the same time other elements of the national defence; second, that it would be no less difficult to regulate by an international agreement the elements of this defence, organized in each country upon very different principles. Hence, the committee regrets its inability to accept the proposition made in the name of the Russian Government. The majority of its members believe that a more thorough study of the question by the governments themselves would be desirable."

The Conference accepted this memorial from the Committee and adjourned after having passed the following resolution:

"The Conference is of the opinion that the restriction of military charges which are at present a heavy burden on the world is extremely desirable for the increase of the material and moral welfare of mankind."

It also added the following wish *(vœu)*:

"The Conference expresses the wish that the governments taking into consideration the proposals made at the Conference may examine the possibility of an agreement as to the limitation of armed forces by land and sea and of war budgets."

During the interval between the First and Second Hague Conferences the Governments paid no attention to these suggestions,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but went ahead increasing their armaments at a rate and on a scale hitherto unprecedented. The only two utterances by responsible heads of States against this militaristic aggrandizement that I recall were made by the British Prime Minister and the President of the United States. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, in a notable speech at Albert Hall, London, in December, 1905, said:

"I hold that the growth of armaments is a great danger to the peace of the world. A policy of huge armaments keeps alive, and stimulates, and feeds the idea that force is the best, if not the only, solution of international differences. It is a policy that tends to inflame old sores and to create new sores, and I submit to you that as the principle of pacific arbitration gains ground, it becomes one of the highest tasks of a statesman to adjust those armaments to a newer and happier condition of things. What nobler rôle could this great country assume than at the fitting moment to place itself at the head of a League of Peace through whose instrumentality this great work might be effected?"

And Theodore Roosevelt, in a letter to the New York Peace and Arbitration Congress held in April, 1907, wrote:

"The most practical step in the diminishing the burden of expense caused by the increasing size of naval armament would, I believe, be an agreement limiting the size of all ships hereafter to be built."

England and the United States accordingly "reserved the right" to bring up the discussion of the limitation of armaments at the Second Hague Conference, especially as Russia had abandoned her championship of the cause and was proposing to bar it out of the discussion. Not, however, until after the Conference had been in session over eight weeks was the subject introduced. Then England made the following tentative proposition, although Germany, Austria, Russia and Japan had announced that they would take no part in the discussion:

"The Government of Great Britain will be ready to communicate each year to the powers that will do the same, its plan of constructing new war-ships and the expenditures which this plan will require. Such an exchange of information will facilitate an exchange of views between the governments on the reductions which by common agreement may be effected. The Britannic Government believes that in this way an understanding may be reached on the expenditures which the states that agree to pursue this course will be justified in entering upon their budgets."

After Mr. Choate in behalf of the American delegation had "expressed his sympathy for the views which have been stated by His Excellency the First Delegate of the British Delegation,"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the discussion was solemnly dropped and the whole question was tabled again in the following resolution:

"The Second Peace Conference confirms the resolution adopted by the Conference of 1899 in regard to the limitation of military expenditure; and inasmuch as military expenditure has considerably increased in almost every country since that time, the Conference declares that it is eminently desirable that the governments should resume the serious examination of this question."

Here the matter rests to-day. All of which shows, I think, that until we have gone much farther along the path of world federation, the problem of the limitation of armaments presents questions, as Chancellor von Bülow has said, "to which there is at present no concrete, serious, practical, realizable answer."

The second question before the Peace Commission—namely, the consideration of combining the navies of the world for peace—will also present many practical difficulties. This is primarily a problem of the use of force, and force except as exercised under law is always arbitrary and usually oppressive or tyrannous. As Professor John Basset Moore has well said:

"The great problem confronting those who wish to do away with war is how to employ the force necessary to the restraint or repression of evil without producing the legal condition of things called a state of war. The most striking imperfection in the international system to-day is the lack of a common agency for the enforcement of law. If, at the present time, a contest by force breaks out between two nations, the conflict is recognized as a war, and other nations assume the attitude of neutrals, even though the cause of the conflict be the flagrant disregard by one of the contending nations of a well-settled principle of international law. Such a condition of things involves an obvious incongruity, the remedy for which would be the organization of a common agency for the enforcement of a law; the addition, in other words, to judicial and legislative power of what we call executive power. This is a problem of the future, probably of the far-distant future; but it is an ideal and a goal toward which it is permissible to labor."

It is, perhaps, not over-sanguine to hope that the existing national armaments may be brought into regular and concerted action for compelling obedience to judicial decisions among nations that have agreed to this method of settling their disputes. It may even be anticipated that the combined military power of the Governments which agree to the foregoing may be used to assist one of themselves in a controversy with a nation that has not agreed previously to resort to arbitration and that refuses

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so to agree upon request. Such an agreement would tend to enthrone law and to suppress arbitrary action. Entering into it would not subject the United States to the necessity of waging war through the erroneous action of its allies in an "entangling alliance," but only for extending the reign of law. This is the fundamental purpose of our Government, and perhaps the United States is now ready to go thus far.

But the questions of the limitation of armament and the proper use of force for preserving peace are only practical after the nations have *federated* themselves for that purpose. Given a world federation, or League of Peace, the problem of the establishment and exercise of an international police power will present no greater difficulties than the similar problem which confronted the framers of the United States Constitution or even of the Articles of Confederation. It must ever be borne in mind, however, that the world constitution will differ in this important respect from the United States Constitution. Our Constitution is both an instrument for federating the States and for guaranteeing each citizen within the Union certain rights; the proposed world constitution as yet merely federates the nations and has no relation whatsoever to any so-called "world citizen."

The third and final question before the Peace Commission is to "consider and report" on any other measures to bring about universal peace. This gives the Commission power to take up the only practical and promising "next step" in the Peace Movement, namely, world federation. That the world is already to some extent federated is proved by the existence of the Interparliamentary Union, the Pan-American and Hague Conferences. The world, however, has scarcely realized this, though glimmerings of the light are already penetrating high places. Our Government nevertheless is imbued with the idea, as is evident from its insistence upon periodical and self-governing conferences at The Hague, from the establishment of the present Peace Commission and from the following highly significant peroration in Secretary Knox's great address, "The Spirit and Purposes of American Diplomacy," delivered on June 15th at the Commencement of the University of Pennsylvania:

"We have reached a point when it is evident that the future holds in store a time when wars shall cease; when the nations of the world shall realize a federation as real and vital as that now subsisting between the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

component parts of a single State; when by deliberate international conjunction the strong shall universally help the weak, and when the corporate righteousness of the world shall compel unrighteousness to disappear and shall destroy the habitations of cruelty still lingering in the dark places of the earth. This is the spirit of the wide world brooding on things to come. That day will be the millennium, of course; but in some sense and degree it will surely be realized in this dispensation of mortal time."

It is gratifying in this connection to remember that in 1890 before a single general arbitration treaty was in existence the United States Congress passed a resolution inviting our State Department to make treaties of arbitration with other nations similarly disposed. That was at a time when all disputes that did not end in war were settled by conciliation through diplomacy. In twenty years the world has gone from conciliation to arbitration. It is now ready to go from arbitration to a world federation. Thus again our Government takes the lead in the movement for universal peace.

Before the First Hague Conference assembled, a considerable literature already existed on world federation, of which that contributed by Penn, Franklin, Burritt, Sumner, Ladd, Hale and others in this country was by no means the least important. After the First Hague Conference, however, it became at once evident that world federation had passed from the dreams of peace advocates into the realities of practical statesmanship. Those Americans who have done much in the last decade to organize the world or spread the idea of world federation include among others Richard Bartholdt, W. J. Bartnett, Hayne Davis, Raymond L. Bridgman, Theodore E. Burton, Nicholas Murray Butler, Andrew Carnegie, Joseph H. Choate, Oscar T. Crosby, Samuel T. Dutton, John W. Foster, Henry B. Granger, William T. Hull, Frederick Lynch, Edwin D. Mead, John B. Moore, Elihu Root, Theodore Roosevelt, James Brown Scott, Albert K. Smiley, Benjamin F. Trueblood and Andrew D. White. Among these Hayne Davis and Richard Bartholdt deserve special recognition. Mr. Davis in many magazine articles has gone exhaustively into the problems of federation and has actually foreshadowed the principal actions of the governments as well as the Interparliamentary Conferences. In 1903 he outlined the formation of an International Union in the image of the United States, emphasizing the fact that the creation of the Hague Court actually constituted a world federation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"To regard the formation of this United Nations as a fancy is to ignore the fact that it has already been formed. To look upon its final perfection in the likeness of the United States as visionary is to ignore the essential political history of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries."

Mr. Bartholdt has ever been foremost among American lawmakers as an advocate of international organization and federation. It was he who proposed the Interparliamentary resolution upon which President Roosevelt acted in calling the Second Hague Conference, and in accordance with those terms the American Delegation at that Conference proposed the establishment of a self-governing permanent international Assembly.

Perhaps the most important suggestions for federating the world to-day are those contained in Mr. Bartholdt's proposals at the Thirteenth Interparliamentary Conference at Brussels in 1905; Uruguay's proposals introduced by José Battle y Ordonez, ex-President of Uruguay, at the Second Hague Conference on July 4th, 1907; Theodore Roosevelt's recent Nobel Peace address delivered May 5th at Christiania, Norway; and Andrew Carnegie's Rectorial address, entitled "A League of Peace," given before the University of St. Andrews on October 17th, 1905.

Mr. Bartholdt's suggestions contemplate a World Federation with a World Congress based on the following five fundamental guarantees:

1. The territory and sovereignty of each nation represented to be respected by all.

2. Each nation to have the right to arm itself according to its own judgment.

3. Each nation to have the right to withdraw at any time.

4. War to remain a lawful mode of action among the members in settling disputes, except as they severally agree to refer questions to arbitration.

5. The armed forces of all the nations to be at the service of the Congress for the enforcement of any decrees rendered by the Hague Court according to treaties of arbitration.

The proposals of ex-President Ordonez are as follows:

"1. From the moment when ten nations (of whom half have at least 25,000,000 inhabitants each) shall agree to submit to arbitration the differences which may arise between them, they shall have the right to form an alliance for the purpose of inquiring into the disagreements and disputes which shall arise between the other nations and to intervene when they shall judge it advantageous in the interest of a just solution.

"2. These allied nations shall have the power to establish a tribunal of obligatory arbitration at The Hague (if the kingdom of Holland is a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

party of the alliance) or at some other city which may be designated for the same purpose.

"3. This alliance in favor of obligatory arbitration will only intervene in cases of international disagreements, and never will have the right to interfere in the internal affairs of any nation.

"4. All the nations which subscribe to the principle of obligatory arbitration will have the right to become a party to the Alliance destined to suppress the evils of war."

Mr. Roosevelt's proposals contained in his Christiania address are in brief:

1. Mutual guarantees to respect national territory and sovereignty and to arbitrate all other questions.
2. The development of the Hague Court and Conferences.
3. The limitation of national armaments by international agreement.
4. A League of Peace, of enlightened Powers, "not only to keep the peace themselves, but to prevent by force, if necessary, its being broken by others."

Mr. Carnegie's suggestions are embodied in the following quotation from his Rectorial address:

"Five nations co-operated in quelling the recent Chinese disorders and rescuing their representatives in Pekin. It is perfectly clear that these five nations could banish war. Suppose even three of them formed a League of Peace—inviting all other nations to join—and agreed that since war in any part of the civilized world affects all nations, and often seriously, no nation shall go to war, but shall refer international disputes to the Hague Conference or other arbitral body for peaceful settlement, the League agreeing to declare non-intercourse with any nation refusing compliance. Imagine a nation cut off to-day from the world. The League also might reserve to itself the right, where non-intercourse is likely to fail or has failed to prevent war, to use the necessary force to maintain the peace, each member of the League agreeing to provide the needed forces or money in lieu thereof, in proportion to her population or wealth. Being experimental and upon trial, it might be deemed advisable, if necessary, at first to agree that any member could withdraw after giving five years' notice, and that the League should dissolve five years after a majority vote of all the members. Further provisions and perhaps some adaptations would be found requisite, but the main idea is here."

It will be seen that all these four proposals contemplate Peace through Justice. All contemplate the use of force to compel obedience to the will of the League, though Mr. Carnegie only after a boycott. All contemplate the development of the Hague Court. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Bartholdt desire that territory and sovereignty shall be the subject neither of arbitration nor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of war, but shall be guaranteed as the basis for the structure of international justice. Señor Ordonez and Mr. Carnegie seem to imply that disputes about territory and sovereignty may be the subject of arbitration, but not of war. Mr. Bartholdt and Mr. Roosevelt make no suggestions as to the number who shall enter the League, but Mr. Carnegie wants at least three and Señor Ordonez at least ten, five of whom shall be great Powers. Mr. Bartholdt limits the use of force to members within the League. Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Carnegie and Señor Ordonez propose the use of the League's armed forces against outside nations. Mr. Bartholdt and Mr. Carnegie would allow the withdrawal of a nation from the League upon due notice. Mr. Bartholdt contemplates the present policy of national armaments, Mr. Carnegie and Señor Ordonez permit but do not seem to prefer present armaments, while Mr. Roosevelt requires the limitation of armaments.

There is some danger in the Roosevelt, Carnegie and Ordonez proposals that a League of Peace should be organized with power to prevent "by force" its being broken by others. Such a League of Peace might easily become a League of Oppression. A League with power to exert its will without constitutional limitations on its own members, to say nothing of those without its jurisdiction, would have the right to be judge and sheriff in its own cause, and that is a violation of the first principles of justice. Constitutional safeguards, therefore, would seem to be essential to any League of Peace that is expected to be of enduring service to humanity.

Prior to the formation of "a more perfect union" our original thirteen States were united in a League or Confederacy somewhat like that now proposed on an international scale. They were obliged by the Articles of this Confederacy to respect each other's territory and sovereignty, to arbitrate all questions among themselves, to assist each other against any foreign foe, not to engage in war unless called upon by the Confederation to do so, or actually invaded by a foreign foe, and not to maintain armed forces in excess of the strength fixed for each State by all the States in Congress assembled.

It is notable that security against aggression from States inside or outside the American Union accompanied the agreement to limit armaments. Thus danger of war and size of armaments were decreased contemporaneously. Both our State

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and National Governments are bound by strict constitutional limitations to prevent abuse of power invested in them. And these limitations have often protected the people against the Government itself. How, then, can any international Government which may come into being be trusted not to abuse its power?

Mr. Roosevelt's concluding statement seems to recognize these difficulties, for he says: "The combination [League of Peace] might at first be only to secure peace within certain definite limits and certain definite conditions." He does not, however, outline these "limits" and "conditions."

It will probably be found that any League of Peace likely to be established at the present time will have to be based on these three propositions:

1. Each nation in the League to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the others.

2. The armies and navies of the members of the League to be at its service to enforce the decrees of the International Tribunal in all questions that the members of the League previously agree to refer to arbitration.

3. The Armies and Navies of the League to sustain any member of the League in a dispute with any outside nation which refuses to arbitrate.

This would put the forces of the League on the side of law and order and not on the side of arbitrary will, as it might conceivably be under the proposals of Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Carnegie or Señor Ordonez.

As far as the United States is concerned, the Peace Commission will have to remember that there are manifest advantages in making proposals which will require no constitutional amendments for their adoption by this country. All the foregoing proposals contemplate the use of the armed forces of the United States in a League of Peace. The power to declare war under our Constitution is vested in Congress alone, and even in time of war Congress is forbidden to make military appropriations for more than two years ahead. It is by no means certain, therefore, that either the Roosevelt, Bartholdt, Carnegie or Ordonez proposal to put the army and navy of the United States at the service of a League of Peace is constitutional. Nevertheless, the organization of an international government, Tennyson's dream of "The Federation of the World," is essential to the further

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

progress of the Peace Movement. All obstacles will have to give way, even constitutional ones. The monster of war must be destroyed. The majesty of law co-extensive with human intercourse can alone achieve this beneficent and inevitable result.

The International Peace Congress which has just concluded its week's session at Christiania, on August 5th, and whose 600 delegates represented all the civilized nations of the earth, applauded every reference to the American Peace Commission and passed a resolution by acclamation urging all the nations to follow the lead of the United States. It is also announced that Mr. Bartholdt in behalf of the American Group will introduce the following resolution into the forthcoming Conference of the Interparliamentary Union at Brussels, from August 29th to September 2nd:

"Resolved, That, in order to devise definite plans for submission to the third Hague Conference, looking to the further perfection of a system of world federation by providing, in addition to an international judiciary, an international legislature as well as international executive powers for the enforcement of judicial decrees, this conference further requests each of the governments and parliaments here represented to forthwith proceed with the appointment and creation of a national commission analagous to the commission recently authorized to be appointed by the Congress of the United States, such commissions to report to their respective parliaments within two years, to the end that, by the time the third international conference will convene at The Hague, namely in 1915, each government may be ready with a well-defined plan of its own for the accomplishment of the purposes above set forth."

If now our Peace Commission can outline a practical plan for World Federation the Governments can be depended upon to press along this line at successive Hague Conferences, until finally, as Victor Hugo prophesied in 1849, "the only battle-field will be the market opening to commerce and the mind opening to new ideas."

HAMILTON HOLT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# SHAKSPERE AND MOLIERE.

BY BRANDER MATTHEWS.

"Of Menander I know only the few fragments," so Goethe declared; "but these gave me so high an idea of him that I look upon this great Greek as the only man who could be compared with Molière"; and when he said this, the great poet, who was also a great critic, had only comedy in his mind, and this led him to pass over Shakspere, who puts forth his topmost power only in tragedy. The comparison of Shakspere and Molière, which the German did not care to draw, imposes itself upon us who speak English and who have been taught to hold Shakspere as the standard by which the foremost writers of every other language must be measured. The English dramatist wrote in an era of expansion and of imaginative energy, and the French dramatist worked in a period of keen intelligence and of social reserve. The Englishman is the master of tragedy, who has also left us a group of delightful comedies; and the Frenchman is the master of comedy, who might have attained to the actual tragic, if only his life had been a little longer.

It is interesting and significant that Sophocles, Shakspere and Molière, the supreme dramatists, held each of them a middle place in the successive stages of the most splendid expansion of the drama in their several tongues. Each of these noble eras was compact in a century, a little more or a little less. Æschylus was born 525 B.C., and Euripides died in 406; and Sophocles holds the position midway. Marlowe was born in 1565, and Shirley died in 1666; and Shakspere flourishes a little before the middle of these hundred years. Corneille was born in 1606 and Racine died in 1699; and Molière runs his briefer career between them. And it may be noted also in Spain there elapsed only a little more than a century from the birth of Lope de Vega in 1562 to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the death of Calderon in 1681,—the Spanish period of dramatic activity beginning earlier than the English and lasting later than the French. Perhaps it was well for Sophocles, for Shakspere and for Molière that they came forward at the maturity of the movement in which they were leaders, neither pioneers in its beginning nor laggards at the end when at last the original impulse was slackening.

Molière was only fifty-one when he died, the same age attained by Lessing and by Balzac. Shakspere survived to be fifty-two, as Thackeray survived to be fifty-three. This comparatively premature death has an importance of its own. Even if they may have done their work thus early and have put forth all their powers before they died, they were deprived of that lingering aftermath of fame which came to Voltaire and Goethe and Victor Hugo, by the fact of survival beyond the threescore years and ten.

In the external circumstances of their several careers, Shakspere and Molière are often curiously alike. They were both born in prosperous households of the middle class; and they were not stinted in their youth, although the affairs of both fathers may have become embarrassed later. Shakspere may have gone to the grammar-school at Stratford; and Molière went to the best school in Paris, getting a more thorough training. Neither of them ever achieved the wide erudition of Lessing, still less the minute scholarship of Racine. Both broke away from their homes to become actors; and both after acting for a while undertook to write plays. Both began modestly as dramatists, content at first to imitate and to patch up earlier work. Even when they had given over this prentice labor, their earlier pieces contained little promise of their later mastery. In "Love's Labor's Lost" and in the "*Etourdi*" we can see clever young writers striving to show off their cleverness, delighting in their own fantasies and not yet knowing enough about life itself to be willing to rely on it unaided. Molière was the manager of his company, while Shakspere was only one of several partners in his; and both of them had a shrewd sagacity in business affairs, governing their private fortunes with skill, putting money out at interest and amassing a comfortable reserve. Both of them liked the good things of life; and neither of them took an austere view of mankind. Shakspere was as little attracted toward the Puritan as Molière was toward the Jansenist.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Both of them made unhesitating use of the works of their predecessors and contemporaries, despoiling alike the alien and the native, taking their raw material wherever they found it, as though they disdained the trouble of mere invention, choosing to put forth their full imagination rather in the interpretation of the stories which others less gifted had failed to use to full advantage. Both of them, despite this casual borrowing of situation, were boldly original in their creation of character. Shakspere found his supreme triumph in the display of character as it expands under opportunity or disintegrates under temptation, whereas Molière, presenting it as permanent, revealed it to us in all its aspects. Both of them were copious in their productivity and swift in execution. Ben Jonson records that Shakspere "never blotted a line"; and Boileau tried in vain to get Molière to correct. Both of them were helpful to younger authors, Shakspere to Jonson and Molière to Racine. Both of them in their later years on occasion collaborated with fellow dramatists, Shakspere with Fletcher and Molière with Corneille. Both of them cared little for the publication of their pieces; and it was only several years after the death of either that his complete plays were published by the pious care of surviving comrades in the theatre. The manuscripts of both have vanished and we have from their pens only a few signatures to legal documents. Both of them had the gift of friendship and were highly esteemed by their associates, even if neither of them was really appreciated by his contemporaries. Both of them took life soberly, never surprised that it was not better. Neither of them much exceeded a half-century of life; Shakspere, who lived a few months longer, had done his work and had withdrawn to rest, while Molière was still in harness, with his goal not yet attained. Neither of them seems to have sought glory for its own sake, satisfied with immediate success and caring little for mere fame.

Many of these resemblances in the career of the two great dramatists may be merely fortuitous; but some of them are strangely significant. And it would not be difficult to pick out other points of similarity or of contrast in their works. The "Comedy of Errors" is not unlike "Amphitryon" in one of its devices; and "Richard III" is not unlike "Don Juan" in its chief character. Ford is akin to Arnolphe in his jealousy, and Autolycus is akin to Mascarille in his resourceful knavery,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

both rascals employing on one occasion the very same trick of not letting a robbed man suspect his loss. Alceste can be contrasted better with Jaques than with Timon. Harpagon repays a comparative study with Shylock, and Tartuffe with Iago. Hamlet's advice to the Players can be set over against the personal discussion of actors and of the art of acting which Molière put into the "*Impromptu de Versailles.*"

There can be no dispute as to the perfect understanding of the principles of the histrionic art possessed by both Shakspere and Molière; and there can also be little doubt that in the actual practice of the art Molière was superior to Shakspere. Molière was acknowledged to be the foremost comedian of his time even by those who thought ill of his plays. Shakspere's position as an actor is far more modest, so far as we can judge from the fact that he did not venture to appear in any of the more important parts in his own plays, whether tragic or comic. "Hamlet" was composed for Burbage, its creator apparently contenting himself with the humbler character of the Ghost, for which dignity and delivery were sufficient equipment; and he is believed also to have impersonated old Adam in "As You Like It." No doubt, Shakspere had a good presence and probably his elocution deserved praise, since this is a quality within the control of intelligence. But the great English dramatist must have been more or less deficient in the fundamental mimetic faculty, without which intelligence alone is ineffective. We know also that Shakspere was not in love with acting, as Molière was, and this distaste for the art may be either the cause or the consequence of his lack of prominence in his calling.

To push the comparison between these two great dramatic poets too far would be unfair to Molière, since Shakspere is the master-mind of all literature. He soared to heights and he explored depths, and he had a range to which Molière could not pretend. His is the spirit of soul-searching tragedy, of youthful and graceful romantic-comedy, of dramatic-romance, of dramatized history; and in no one of these is Molière his rival. But in the comedy of real life he is not Molière's rival. In every variety of the comic drama Molière is unequalled—in farce, in the comedy of situation, in the comedy of character, and in the comedy which is almost stiffened into drama yet without ceasing to be comedy. Shakspere's greatest strength

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is in tragedy, after all, even though he delights us also with comedy. Molière is at home in comedy only, even though he had a latent tragic possibility. "In depth, penetrativeness and powerful criticism of life, Molière, comic as he is and not tragic, belongs to the same family as Shakspere and Sophocles," so Matthew Arnold maintains, pointing out that he had also "one great advantage over Shakspere" in that "he wrote for a more developed theatre, a more developed society."

Arnold also suggests that Molière was "probably by nature a better theatre-poet than Shakspere; he had a keener sense for theatrical situation." This is a hard saying, for it is difficult to admit that Shakespere was not a born playwright who acquired an early mastery of his craft. But the English dramatist was less ambitious than the French, less conscientious, and less careful. Admirable as his workmanship is in his nobler tragedies, it can be very slovenly, especially in his dramatic-romances, "Cymbeline" and the "Winter's Tale." In his romantic-comedies he generally tumbles together two or three independent stories, leaving us to discover, as best we can, which one of them he intended to centre our interest on. Molière has only a single plot, orderly and lucid; and this is partly because he sees life clearly and uncomplicated. Coquelin asserted that Molière has more art and more method than Shakspere; "he graduates his effects better."

The real distinction between Molière and Shakspere merely as playwrights is that Molière is an artist always and that Shakspere is an artist only intermittently and when the spirit moves him. Molière always does his best; even a play of an inferior type he makes as good as he can, as good as a play of that type can be. Shakspere is an artist putting forth his full power only when he happens to be keenly interested in his subject,—in "Othello," for example, and in "Macbeth." If we examine his work as a whole we can see that he frequently does not exert his constructive skill. Often he is careless of form, huddling his action together anyhow, satisfied with the easiest way of handling it and relying rather on his insight into character and motive and on his unquenchable springs of poetry. Wisdom was his for the asking, and almost without taking thought; but solid construction taxes the mind and Shakspere often neglects the preliminary scaffolding which a vital action always demands and which Molière and Sophocles never fail to provide.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The explanation for this is not far to seek; indeed it may be found in Arnold's suggestion. The English dramatist was working for a less developed theatre than the French and for a less developed society. There was no standard of artistic perfection imposed on him by the pressure of an educated public opinion. There was nothing to keep him up to the mark, except his own ambition; and this was uncertain and even flagging. He seems often to have felt that what was good enough for his uncritical audience, for the unlettered groundlings, was good enough for him. This is why he rarely rises superior to the traditions of the rude and semi-mediæval theatre for which he worked, content to avail himself of its traditions and to take the short cuts it authorized. This is why Iago is less subtly presented than Tartuffe. Iago is frankly a villain, and he knows himself for what he is, unbosoming himself freely and frequently to the spectators, whereas Tartuffe never drops the mask until he stands at bay, and may very possibly have had no suspicion of his own evilness.

Not a few of those who have most highly appreciated Shakspere have felt this occasional carelessness, although most of them have failed to express it. Coleridge links the two masters together and tells us that "in the comedy of Shakspere and Molière the more accurate my knowledge and the more profoundly I think, the greater is the satisfaction that mingles with my laughter." Also George Meredith, in his discussion of the comic spirit and of the idea of comedy, recurs again and again to Molière, holding him up to our admiration as the unsurpassable model, and declaring that "if life is likened to the comedy of Molière, there is no scandal in the comparison." And this is what no one could rightly say of the comedy of Shakspere, who put his richest comic character into a straggling chronicle-play and whose romantic-comedies are compounded of arbitrary fantasy; delightful as they are, they bear no relation to real life as it ever existed anywhere but in a fancied Illyria or in that distant Bohemia which is a desert country by the sea.

Not only does Shakspere refrain from dealing with the men and women of his own time in his own country, not only are his most comic characters sporadic and incidental to a tale of pure romance, of young lovers meeting and mating in the springtime of their lives, he is also willing always to gratify the English and Elizabethan liking for an empty playing with words, for a wit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which is merely external and almost detachable, and which unrelated to character tends in no wise to elucidate it. His humor is frequently verbal, which Molière's never is. "Molière was no mere wit," so Coquelin reminded us. "Puns, points, collocations of droll sounds,—these are all absent from his work. . . . He wished to bring a laugh only by touches of nature. It is not from him as an author that his witticisms come; it is from his characters; and they come naturally and by the force of things." Of course, this is true very frequently of Shakspere also, especially of his Falstaff; but often it is not true, and his characters descend to the bandying of repartee and to the making of quips which do not serve to reveal character or to advance the story. Molière indeed declared his own principle in the "*Critique de l'Ecole des Femmes,*" when he asserted that a certain joke had not been put in by the author "as a clever saying of his own, but only as a thing that characterized the man."

Perhaps the explanation for this willingness of Shakspere to give his audience the verbal witticisms they relished may be sought in the fact that his romantic-comedies are more romantic than they are comic, whereas Molière's comedies are essentially realistic. Touchstone and even Jaques are only incidental and accessory; and the core of Shakspere's comedy is the coming together of Rosalind and Orlando. Molière has a pair of young lovers merely to hold his plot together, to make a story around Orgon and Chrysale and Harpagon. Shakspere puts his pair of young lovers in the forefront; they are his comedy and all else imports little. In other words, Shakspere's comic characters interest us by what they are, whereas Molière's often take our attention more by what they do. Comic action is the life of many a play of Molière's, although not of the greatest; and as a result character is more simply presented in Molière's pieces than in Shakspere's: it is less complex. So it is that Shakspere's clowns and other of his humorous figures wear their motley outside, while Molière's characters wear it within.

The secret of the acceptable mingling of romance and of comedy is Shakspere's only; and what he did in the vein of romantic-comedy he alone could do. The form itself may be anomalous and open to adverse analysis; but the result is charming—when it is Shakspere who stirs the mixture with the magic of his lyric gift. But of the few who have sought to follow in the path he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trod through the faery woodland, none have grasped the elusive prize. In other words, Shakspere's comedies are highly individual; they are his and his alone. They are not characteristic of his nationality; they are little related to the manners and customs of his own time and of his own people. They are not racial, as Molière's comedies are. They are too idealistic, too remote from every-day life, from the rude experience of actuality, to be all that comedy can be. They belong to a very special type, too lyric, perhaps even too poetic, to be acceptable as a picture of the real world about us; and it is just such a picture that we have a right to expect in comedy. The romantic drama may voice our aspirations and show us what we dream that we would like to be, and tragedy may set before us the things we dread; but comedy has for its duty to depict us as we are actually. When it most completely fulfils its function comedy is not individual, like Shakspere's, but social, like Molière's.

Undeniable as is Shakspere's comic force, indisputable as is his power of creating humorous character and of handling amusing situation, it is not in comedy that he has most satisfactorily exhibited his consummate genius as a dramatist. For the full display of his art he needed the towering framework of tragedy; and it is in comedy that he is less of a theatre-poet than Molière. It is by his tragedy far more than by his comedy that Shakspere has conquered the nations of the modern world. Hamlet and Othello and Macbeth are known to millions who have never heard of Viola and Beatrice and Anne Page. This is due partly to the exportability of tragedy, which works with the universal emotions. A great tragedy can go abroad, whereas a great comedy has often to tarry at home because of its very supremacy as a comedy, because of the adequacy of its reproduction of contemporary reality. "Julius Cæsar" can be taken anywhere, and its tragic action will arouse the interest of the spectators whatever their race or their degree of culture; but the "*Femmes Savantes*" can meet with fit and full appreciation only when it is performed before those who can understand its strokes and who can recognize the types it presents. The passions are much the same the wide world over; but wit and humor are often local, and character often depends on time and place.

The predominant influence which Shakspere has exerted upon modern tragedy Molière has exerted upon modern comedy. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only dramatist of the nineteenth century who sought to recall again in his own plays the evanescent grace and fleeting beauty of Shakspere's romantic-comedy is Alfred de Musset. All the other writers of comedy, not only in France, but in England and in Germany, have found their model in Molière. This is due partly to the fact that the practical playwrights of to-day, adjusting their plays to the theatre of our own era, shrink instinctively from the imitation of Shakspere, whose comedies are semi-mediæval because they were in his time adjusted to the ruder Elizabethan platform-stage and because they therefore need to be taken apart and put together again before they can be represented on the picture-frame stage of our latter-day playhouses. But it is due also to the fact that in Molière the modern dramatists find the outer form which concords with the conditions of the theatre of the twentieth century, and also the final model of the comedy which represents largely and liberally the realities of life.

Less myriad-minded than Shakspere, less lyric and less poetic, lacking the depth and the width of the English dramatist, dying early before his tragic possibilities had a chance to unfold themselves, Molière is more completely the master of comedy. He is a more conscious and conscientious artist in his structure. He has more accurately achieved to the ideal of that high comedy which is the mirror of society and the revelation of humanity in its larger relations. That he, rather than Shakspere, should have most richly expressed himself in comedy, is a strange thing, since Matthew Arnold, borrowing the hint from Sainte-Beuve, is plainly right in saying that "Shakspere has more joy than Molière, more assurance and more peace." Perhaps Molière's humor flowered out of his melancholy and his satire out of his sadness; but whatever their obscure roots, the humor is there in his plays, the satire also, and, in addition, the sheer fun which brings irresistible laughter.

BRANDER MATTHEWS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THE RACE TO THE WHITE HOUSE.

BY IRA E. BENNETT.

No contest among men—intellectual or physical—involves a greater stress of mind and body, a more constant watchfulness and planning, a heavier outlay of money, and a keener insight and cunning, than the race to the White House. Political parties as well as candidates are in the race. It is a "marathon" in which a few runners are accompanied by hundreds, thousands, tens of thousands of other runners, who scheme and push and aid their champions. No expenditure of effort is too great, no outlay of money is too heavy to deter the contestants. All the resources of civilization are drawn upon to bring the champion to the goal — the telegraph, the telephone, lightning trains, newspapers, and so forth, with the aeroplane in sight. The machinery of the government is utilized, of course; the rural free delivery, the postal frank, the "Congressional Record," the appointment of pickets and sentinels in all parts of the country, paid for by Uncle Sam, but working for the runner in the race.

Nothing but a war between two strong powers compares with a Presidential campaign in scientific organization, breadth of operations, brilliance of manœuvring, tactical and strategical skill, and expenditure of money and effort.

A Presidential campaign never has a clear-cut beginning. It has begun before its operations are made manifest. Sometimes it has been born like a maggot in a masterful and scheming brain, incubating for years before it becomes the spirit of an army's movements. Sometimes it is developed from the result of a previous race, and its course marked from the moment it is started. At other times it is a merger of smaller movements, as though several groups of runners mingled and joined hands in a race.

The mere mention of the names of men who are popularly re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

garded as Presidential "possibilities" for 1912 reveals the fact that the race began long ago. It started, no one knows when; perhaps on an evening in the White House, when, as he told me later, Theodore Roosevelt looked musingly at the picture upon his mantel of a farmer sitting at his fireside, and said: "What would that old man say? What is right in his eyes? For whatever he thinks is right is the thought of the American people; and that is what I shall do." Whereupon Mr. Roosevelt announced that he would not listen to the suggestion of a third term; that the election of 1904 meant in practical effect a second term for him; and then openly directed his efforts to the election of Mr. Taft.

From the moment that Mr. Roosevelt obeyed the inspiration of the picture of the old farmer, the campaign of 1912 assumed another aspect. This was unforeseen, perhaps, by him, as it was by other men. At any rate, he could not have peered so shrewdly into the seeds of time as to have been assured that Taft would be elected, that he would induce Congress to enact more and better legislation than Roosevelt himself had been able to secure, and would glide into the summer breathing-spell of 1910 in perfect condition for the mighty race of 1912.

During these doldrum days, when the runners are going slowly and saving their strength, let us look them over, with their associates and helpers. Who are they, and how do they stand in the running? I shall look over the field from the Washington standpoint—the knoll from which distant movements are surveyed and often first detected, and behind which, sometimes, movements are started unseen by those on the knoll, emerging later to surprise and overtake the swiftest runners. The Presidential "possibilities"—bear in mind the elasticity of that word—as seen from Washington number about sixteen, nine of them being in the Republican camp and seven in the Democratic:

REPUBLICANS.

William H. Taft, of Ohio.
James S. Sherman, of New York.
Theodore Roosevelt, of New York.
Jonathan P. Dolliver, of Iowa.
Albert J. Beveridge, of Indiana.
Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin.
Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa.
Philander C. Knox, of Pennsylvania.
Charles W. Fairbanks, of Indiana.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DEMOCRATS.
William J. Bryan, of Nebraska.
Judson Harmon, of Ohio.
William J. Gaynor, of New York.
William R. Hearst, of New York.
Champ Clark, of Missouri.
Woodrow Wilson, of New Jersey.
Thomas R. Marshall, of Indiana.

Before the reader swiftly eliminates names from this list and selects his "probabilities"—a liberty which the writer purposes to take, also, a little later—let him reflect upon the fact that the whirligig of time moves more rapidly in politics than in ordinary affairs; that the impossible often materializes; and that politics, like Lear's hand, "smells of mortality." A few months ago the name of John Johnson, of Minnesota, would have led the Democratic list. But he is in his grave. And as the strong men strip for the race they cannot forget that Death runs alongside, ready at a twinkling to trip them. So the last in the running may be the first at the end.

The probability that William H. Taft will be renominated by the Republicans is so strong that something approaching the force of a political volcanic eruption must occur if he is to be displaced. Many Republicans, insurgents so-called, believe that this eruption will occur. They point to the lightning and call attention to the rumbling and quaking in the Middle West. They take the position that the American people have awakened morally, and will not tolerate any of the old methods of politics; that the masses are impatient; that they want a leader who will dash far ahead of any other in the march for reform; that Theodore Roosevelt is this man, and that at the "psychological moment" the demand for Roosevelt will sweep aside everything and everybody in the way.

It may be a true reading of the signs; but I doubt it, for these reasons: (1) The great mass of the people is conservative, neither reactionary nor radical. The voters in the mass move slowly ahead, feeling their way as an elephant tries the ground before him. If this is not true, how will the election of 1896 be explained? That was a time when radicalism was more rampant than now, and the radicals were led by a dashing, eloquent young champion whose personality was most attractive. Yet the voters took the safe and tried candidate, rather than the radical. If

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there should be a quarrel between Taft and Roosevelt, and Roosevelt should consent to run again, the parallel would then be gone, for Roosevelt is safe and tried, in spite of his apparent radicalism, and progressive voters would not hesitate to vote for him. Such a situation, however, is highly improbable, for many reasons, one sufficient reason being the fact that Colonel Roosevelt has served two terms in the White House, according to his own statement, and will not be drawn into another candidacy. He put his foot down firmly in 1908, and he is just as able to do so in 1912.

(2) President Taft has passed safely through the most dangerous part of the Presidential experience—the first year. A President may be likened to a bridegroom. Congress is the President's bride, and a capricious, self-willed, coy, "coming-on" vixen she is. Mr. Roosevelt had his squabbles with this quarrelsome dame, and frequently he found the shrew too much for him. Mr. Taft himself was in hot water for nearly a year, but good nature and patience accomplished much, and a shrewd judgment of his partner's eccentricities did more. He yielded to her vanity for the sake of obtaining something valuable. At the end of the session President Taft was able to count a long list of favors won from his high-spirited consort, while she departed on her vacation, smiling and well pleased.

There is no evidence that President Taft will have any serious trouble in his relations with Congress. The first year ended, it is probable that he will go through the rest of his term with fair weather. In any event, there can hardly be such a squall as to wreck the ship, or even to spring a serious leak. So a fair-minded man must assume that Mr. Taft, by the summer of 1912, will have made reasonable progress and fairly discharged his duties. He will then be fifty-five years of age. With good luck on his side, he will be in fine physical condition, and in his intellectual prime.

(3) The people will be disposed to give Mr. Taft a second term if his first term shall prove fairly satisfactory. There will be great excitement, doubtless, and the uproar may confuse the observer; but if it be borne in mind that Mr. Taft received twice as many electoral votes as Mr. Bryan, the tumult and the shouting will be somewhat discounted. No other man in the United States ever received as large a vote at any election as Mr. Taft received in 1908. The voice of discontent is always heard, but the man who is contented keeps still. So the cautious observer will not too readily

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mistake the campaign thunder for the authentic roar of the earthquake.

The Republican party renominated Lincoln, Grant and McKinley and nominated Roosevelt to succeed himself. It did not nominate Arthur and lost the election. It failed to renominate Harrison and lost. For sufficient reason it did not renominate Hayes, and in that single instance it succeeded in electing another man. This tendency to renominate Presidents may be explained on the theory that a refusal to do so would be a confession that the administration had been a failure. The party in 1912, therefore, will not without strong reason acknowledge that four years of Mr. Taft is enough.

(4) Mr. Taft by 1912 will have thoroughly mastered the Presidential office, with all its immense political power. It will be his own, to wield in his own behalf, and within reasonable bounds there will be no objection to his exercise of such power. The politicians of both parties make much of the iniquity of Presidential influence, but it is the politicians themselves who are most influenced. They are nearer to the sweets, and their taste for them is more keenly developed. The millions of voters know nothing of personal interest in the Presidential race; but the politicians, who are near the runners, have much at stake. The occupant of the White House, if a candidate for re-election, may distribute legitimate favors with a lavish hand, and expectant politicians always see more to come. They are likely to cling to the present distributor of good things, rather than desert him and risk disaster by attempting to overthrow him.

The work of utilizing Presidential influence and favor for re-election purposes began on the day when Mr. Taft was sworn into office. It is not necessary that he should attend to such matters; they are looked after very capably by his henchmen. Whatever this influence may be worth in winning votes—perhaps it is a drawback, rather than a benefit—it is certainly a powerful weapon when used before the national convention. With its aid an organization will be built up in each State, and these, combined, will dominate the national convention and place Mr. Taft at the head of the ticket, always providing that the course of true politics will run smooth.

James S. Sherman, of New York, must be reckoned as a possibility, not because he is "Sunny Jim" Sherman, but because he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is Vice-President. Of the twenty-seven persons who have served as President, five have been called from the Vice-Presidency. The percentage is high—too high to be ignored when discussing the mutabilities incident upon the selection of one man from fifteen million voters to act as chief magistrate.

I have included Theodore Roosevelt among the Republican possibilities in deference to the opinion of those whose admiration for him leads them honestly to believe that he is the one man needful, and that the big and persistent demand for his return to the White House will overcome his own will. Unquestionably he is the leading American; his popularity boundless, and of such vitality that all political compasses and charts are worthless in the attempt to gauge him or his course. But there is one thing about Mr. Roosevelt which, I believe, is underestimated by his friends and foes alike, and that is the binding force upon himself of his own word. It is impossible for Theodore Roosevelt to be untrue to himself. The core and kernel of his strength is his honesty. This honesty considers the substance, and not the shadow. It would not be Rooseveltian honesty if it were tempted into tortuous paths by pretext, excuse, evasion, or mental reservation.

In substance, if not in exact words, Mr. Roosevelt told the American people in 1904, and still later, that the term to which he had been elected was his last. In 1908 a very strenuous effort was made to induce him to change his mind. The effort was vain. He could not be shaken. If it had been necessary, the country might have witnessed an example of stubbornness of such colossal proportions as to astonish history; but it was not necessary. Mr. Roosevelt does not sit back in mere stubbornness. His method is to carry the war into Africa. He managed affairs so that the demand for his re-election was set aside in spite of itself. He kept faith literally with himself—his conscience. What appeared to be an ill-considered election-night pledge in 1904—a mere ebullition of spirits—was found to be a pledge as binding as though Roosevelt were the master and not the child of destiny.

He turned away the Presidency in 1908 when it was his for the taking. Why, then, should he palter with his conscience by taking the Presidency, when he can keep faith by thrusting it away?

Mr. Roosevelt's friends may reply to this argument in this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fashion: "Roosevelt could run in 1912 without breaking any pledge, actual or implied. You credit superhuman attributes to him when you say he would regard the pledge of 1904-1908 as binding in 1912. Anyway, we shall force him to take the nomination and the election, because he is necessary, pledge or no pledge."

To this I answer: Mr. Roosevelt himself said he had served two terms, and that it was proper that the unwritten law prohibiting three terms should be observed. If this was true in 1904 and 1908 it will be true in 1912. You did not take his word in 1904, when he said he would not run again. But you could not budge him. You do not take his word as applying to the next contest, and you hope to budge him. But you will fail.

If 8,000,000 voters — that being the Republican strength in round numbers—could move in a solid body, physically, and grasp Theodore Roosevelt by the arm or shoulder and force him into the White House, the thing could be done. But the 8,000,000 cannot act together, and Mr. Roosevelt is more than a match for them. He can bring about a condition in which the 8,000,000 must vote according to his will, and not their own, or go over to the other side. He is a political magician, and they are not even politicians. He works from the core outwardly to the remotest corner; they are on the outskirts, shouting in unison, but doing nothing else in common. He creates conditions; they pursue a theory.

After several years of careful study of both men at close range, during which time I have conversed with both on many subjects, including their relations with each other, I am convinced that the friendship between Theodore Roosevelt and William H. Taft is based on absolute trust and confidence. I do not believe that Colonel Roosevelt would be false to any man, and it is unthinkable that he would secretly connive at his own succession to Taft. He would be conniving at it if he were to permit his friends to form a combination in his behalf. Therefore he must put his foot down upon such plans if they should develop, and that is exactly what is to be expected of him.

If we could put aside Roosevelt's conscientious scruples, and picture him as anxious to return to the White House, without regard to any obligations to the people or to his friends, we must face the fact that his candidacy would tend to destroy the Republican party by splitting it into factions. Mr. Roosevelt has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been a regular party man from the first day of his public life. He has never bolted. The will of the majority has been good enough for him. His political sagacity has always induced him to bow to temporary defeat within his party, if necessary, rather than to risk the transfer of power to the other party. Whatever comes, he will not disrupt the Republican party.

Three men in the Senate are conspicuous as "insurgent" leaders, and any one of them may strike the path that leads to the White House. Jonathan P. Dolliver, of Iowa, Albert J. Beveridge, of Indiana, and Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin, are strong, clean men, and the Presidency would be safe in the hands of any of them. None would be as radical in the White House as his career in the Senate would seem to indicate. There is a vast difference between the giving of advice and the exercise of power.

The term "insurgent" is a misnomer when it implies an attack by these men upon the Republican party. They are Republicans to the core. They cannot be driven out of a party to which they are as devotedly attached as any of their critics. The word "progressive" is a better description of them. They are ahead of the mass of their party in many ways. They are pressing forward, blazing the way into untried fields. As a pathfinder runs against impassable obstacles and retraces his steps to find better travelling, so these ambitious Republicans through the operation of forces vastly more powerful than any now at work; and yet that party fought six years before it triumphed.

Dolliver, Beveridge, La Follette—a trio of promising men, truly. Dolliver is the best orator, although Beveridge holds high rank; Beveridge is the keenest judge of public opinion, although La Follette has been wonderfully successful in that line; and La Follette is the most persistent, unflagging worker, although Beveridge and Dolliver are always at it. Dolliver hails from Iowa, which would have worked against his chances for the Presidency a few years ago. Why should a candidate be nominated from a State that is sure to go Republican anyhow? But Iowa is a doubtful State now, or would be in the twinkling of an eye, under certain conditions. Beveridge is in a favorable situation, coming from a State that is proverbially uncertain politically. La Follette gains no particular strength by reason of his residence.

Dolliver and Beveridge are the best of friends, each well know-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing the ambition of the other to reach the White House, and understanding better than outsiders can the difficulties involved in a candidacy under insurgent auspices. La Follette is fighting his own battles, as usual. He is a rugged, intensely serious politician, having few of the social graces. He wins popular support by his steady hammering, but there are few who find in him any of the magnetism that vitalizes such men as William J. Bryan, for example. In the Senate La Follette has few intimates, while Dolliver and Beveridge count many friends among their colleagues.

In the closing days of the recent session of Congress, Senator Dolliver dared to go a little farther than his insurgent rivals for the Presidency in attacking President Taft. Dolliver did not "go the limit," but he went far enough to disclose to the public what every public man in Washington has known for a long time—that is, that he is a candidate for the Presidency as a progressive, or radical Republican; that he is pushing forward as fast as he dares, having in mind two considerations: First, that the most conspicuous and daring progressive is likely to stand the best chance of preferment; and second, that if he goes too far he may discover that his party is not following him, and that he may be compelled to retrace his steps in full view of the derisive armies. Just how far to go—just how sharply to criticise and disparage Mr. Taft—just how to keep in touch with the first rank of insurgency—that is the problem with which Dolliver, Beveridge, and La Follette are wrestling.

Dolliver has been bold; Beveridge has been cunning; La Follette has been resolute. While Dolliver was unlimbering his guns against Mr. Taft, Beveridge discovered that Mr. Taft was rapidly regaining popularity, and forthwith the Indianian, who had fought Mr. Taft on tariff matters and given him grudging recognition in the Indiana platform, invited the President to Indiana. Beveridge made the most of his opposition to the Payne-Aldrich tariff, but he equalized this aberration from party regularity by stoutly supporting some of the Taft measures. He is not an out-and-out insurgent, as La Follette is; he is an insurgent upon occasion. La Follette goes off the reservation alone; Beveridge and Dolliver are willing to go, but they want company.

Many progressives regard Senator Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa, a stronger Presidential candidate than Dolliver, Beveridge, or La Follette. Mr. Cummins was a radical before his colleague Dolliver

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was; he fought out the "railroad question" as Governor of Iowa, and had attracted national attention before entering the Senate as the successor to William B. Allison. He is a popular speaker, an outspoken and uncompromising "insurgent," and a diligent student of latter-day political problems.

The chance that Philander C. Knox or Charles W. Fairbanks may be nominated in 1912 seems very remote indeed, but it is possible that conditions might change to such an extent as to make their names quite prominent. In some conceivable contingency the "conservatives" might select Knox or Fairbanks as their champion against any progressive who might come forth. Secretary Knox possesses many of the qualifications desirable in a President, and is believed by public men in Washington to be capable of rallying strong support in case he should be thrust forward as Mr. Taft's successor. Former Vice-President Fairbanks has held the high regard of millions of his countrymen, in spite of a series of political misfortunes that would have destroyed a weaker man. His trip around the world placed him in the best possible light as a dignified, tactful and patriotic American.

The insurgency in the Republican party deals with policies, rather than with men. The Democratic insurgency deals with one man—William J. Bryan. His name is placed at the head of Democratic possibilities for the reason that it is yet to be demonstrated that his mastery of the party has been broken. Two years ago it was absolute. November, 1908, was a black month for him, for it witnessed his own defeat and the elevation of at least two rivals to prominence in the public eye. These rivals are Governor Judson Harmon of Ohio and Governor Thomas R. Marshall of Indiana, Democrats who carried their States in the face of the landslide for Mr. Taft.

Mr. Bryan has given very good proof of his desire to run again by attacking his most dangerous rival, Governor Harmon. His attack upon Governor Harmon was unsuccessful, so far as Ohio Democrats were concerned. They rejected Mr. Bryan's suggestions, renominated Harmon for Governor, and formally presented him as a candidate for President. The Democrats of Nebraska, also, took such action as to indicate that Bryan's hold in his own State had been weakened. Later, in July of this year, they repudiated his "county option" plan for the control of the liquor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

traffic. This action was most significant, for the reason that county option is not in itself obnoxious to the people of Nebraska, judging from past expressions. Bryan's opponents in his own party assert that the refusal of the Democratic convention to adopt the "county option" plank was based upon the desire to "throw off the Bryan yoke." In its best aspect, the upshot was not complimentary to Mr. Bryan.

It remains to be proved, however, that Mr. Bryan is unable to control a majority of the delegates to the next Democratic national convention. Insurgents would spring up against him in every State, if the time were ripe. But they are like the Republican insurgents in going cautiously for a while. There may be more fight in the old lion than is supposed. Mr. Bryan polled 6,400,000 votes in 1908—a very respectable following, indeed. He received more votes in 1908 than in 1900, and 1,400,000 more than Parker received in 1904. It is easy to say that Bryan's strength has departed, but another thing to demonstrate it in convention.

Notwithstanding these facts, the eyes of Democrats are turned toward Ohio, where Governor Harmon is to do battle with the combined forces of national and State Republicanism. Harmon ran 50,000 votes ahead of Bryan in 1908, and was elected Governor by 19,000 plurality. His vote was 552,569, against 502,721 for Bryan. Mr. Taft beat Bryan by 69,000 votes in Ohio, but Harris, the Republican candidate for Governor, ran behind Harmon in all the big counties of Cuyahoga, Franklin, Hamilton, Lucas, Montgomery and Stark.

Governor Harmon has displayed great ability as a politician in administering the office of Governor. He has pursued graft with courage, attended closely to his official duties, expressed himself discreetly on national questions, and in other ways improved his strategic position. His fitness for the Presidency cannot be questioned. He is a native of Ohio, sixty-four years of age, robust in health. He and William H. Taft were in frequent contact in Cincinnati while Harmon was a Judge of the Superior Court, 1878-88. They are good friends, although not intimate. Harmon has been a mayor, judge, law lecturer, railroad receiver, and general practitioner. His only service in the National Government was as Attorney-General in the Cleveland Cabinet, from 1895 to March, 1897.

Harmon is generally regarded as better Presidential timber

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than Governor Marshall of Indiana, whose triumph in a Republican year brought him into national prominence. Harmon has had much more experience in politics and public affairs than Marshall; has a more impressive presence; is, in short, an elder, if not a better soldier. Marshall is eight years younger than Harmon. He was born in Indiana, and practised law in the comparatively unimportant city of Columbia from his admission to the bar in 1875 until 1908, when he was elected Governor. As a stump speaker Marshall is excellent. His vote-getting ability was well tested in the campaign of 1908. He ran 10,000 votes ahead of Bryan, and defeated his opponent, James E. Watson, by 14,453 votes. Marshall carried the State by 4,000 votes more than Mr. Taft's plurality.

As to the advantage of residence, there is little choice between Harmon and Marshall. Ohio and Indiana are both doubtful States. As the Republicans nominate their Presidential candidate first, as a rule, the Democratic choice may be swayed by their opponents' action; for instance, if an insurgent like Beveridge should be nominated, the Democrats might pick Marshall for the sake of utilizing his local strength.

Mayor Gaynor is in a good position to attract the attention of Democrats. New York is the most important State in the Union, politically, and the most independent. It has thirty-nine electoral votes, and may have more before the next electoral college meets. More than once the vote of New York has determined the Presidency, although the old saying, "As goes New York, so goes the Union," was disproved in 1864, 1868, and 1876.

Mayor Gaynor has twice declined the Democratic nomination for Governor of New York, which was the stepping-stone to the Presidency in the cases of Cleveland and Roosevelt, and the door through which many men have passed to national office as Vice-Presidents, Cabinet officers, Senators, and, in Governor Hughes's case, to the United States Supreme Court. Gaynor is a native of New York State, and is fifty-nine years of age. He worked as a newspaper man while studying law, and practised law from 1875 until elected to the State Supreme Court in 1893.

The Mayor of New York is a stalwart and persistent fighter. His work in purifying the Democratic party of corrupt rings brought him recognition as a strong figure, and in spite of his disinclination to leave the bench he was called upon to head his



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

party in the municipal campaign of 1909. Gaynor received 250,378 votes, defeating Bannard (Republican) by 73,000 votes, and Hearst (Civic Association) by 96,000 votes. Gaynor has made himself popular by devoting his time strictly to city affairs, and notably by improving the police department.

Many signs point to a desire on the part of William R. Hearst to be the Democratic nominee in 1912. One of these signs is his sharp criticism of Mayor Gaynor, which has the earmarks of a purpose to wear down and destroy Gaynor's strength as a Presidential possibility. Another of Mr. Hearst's moves indicates that he regards Theodore Roosevelt as the probable Republican nominee, unless Roosevelt's popularity can be lessened. Mr. Hearst, after a visit to the White House in the early summer, issued a remarkable statement, in which he bitterly assailed Mr. Roosevelt and highly praised Mr. Taft. Among political observers in Washington this was taken to be a plain intimation that Mr. Hearst regarded Roosevelt as a more dangerous antagonist than Mr. Taft. Since that time, while Mr. Hearst was in Europe, he renewed his criticism of Colonel Roosevelt and took occasion to praise Mr. Taft. The virtual surrender of the Independence party to the Democratic, followed by Mr. Hearst's utterances, paves the way to the entrance by Mr. Hearst into the next Democratic national convention as a candidate for the Presidency. In 1904 he was by no means a negligible figure at the St. Louis convention. In 1908 he was an independent. By 1912, from present appearances, he will have been in the Democratic fold long enough to match swords with Bryan for the mastery of the party. Mr. Hearst may not find it advisable to present himself as a candidate, but it is conceivable that he will be able to name the candidate.

The announcement of President Woodrow Wilson's candidacy for Governor of New Jersey brought him into prominence at once as a Presidential possibility. As in the case of Governor Harmon, the chances of the president of Princeton as a Presidential candidate hinge upon the outcome of this fall's elections. If President Wilson should be defeated, there will be little disposition among Democrats to consider him for the greater race; but if he should become Governor of New Jersey, for the term beginning January, 1911, he would be found to possess many elements of strength as a candidate for the Presidency.

Dr. Wilson is a Southerner, but without the handicaps borne

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by Southerners of the Civil War period. He was born in Virginia fifty-four years ago, and obtained much of his education in the South. Leaving the law to specialize in certain studies, he went North, and in a comparatively short time became one of the leading educators of the country. His political writings have brought him renown, and his executive capacity as displayed in the management of Princeton has proved him to be a man of practical affairs as distinguished from the mere collegian.

If it should appear that the hold of William J. Bryan has been broken, and that conservative Democrats are in the ascendant, the election of Dr. Wilson to be Governor of New Jersey might be the signal for a strong movement in his behalf at the next Democratic national convention. Assuming that his administration of affairs as Governor will have been as successful as his other undertakings, Democrats will lay stress upon his strength in New York as well as in New Jersey, and his nomination might follow in pursuance of the conviction that he who carries New York will carry the election. The fall campaign in New Jersey cannot be ignored by those who are scanning the larger horizon; for out of that State may come the man who is to contend for the Presidency.

Champ Clark, of Bowling Green, Missouri, is a most engaging figure. He is the delight of the Chautauqua platform, and visitors to the House of Representatives invariably ask to see him, as soon as they have inspected "Uncle Joe" Cannon. Champ Clark is a steady reader of the Bible—as well as of many other books—and his debate is full of Biblical allusions, most of them very aptly applied. He loves the homespun in argument, and is excelled only by Ben Tillman in the ability to use pat or witty phrases smacking of the soil. But Mr. Clark is no mere "cornfield lawyer," as Tillman boasts he is. Clark was a college president at twenty-three years of age. In his own account of his life, furnished to the Congressional Directory, he remarks that he "worked as a hired farm hand, clerked in a country store, edited a country newspaper, and practised law."

After John Sharp Williams of the Yazoo was elected to the Senate, Champ Clark succeeded him as Democratic leader in the House, and the ambition of his life—just now—is to be elected Speaker of the House. "Barkis is willin'," said Mr. Clark to a New York audience after Congress adjourned, and he might have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

added, "Barkis is getting busy." The Democratic leader is doing his best to elect a Democratic House, and if his party should have a majority his election to succeed "Uncle Joe" as Speaker is a foregone conclusion.

In that event Champ Clark may attract such attention as to make him a formidable candidate for the Presidential nomination. He has maintained silence on this point, and has concentrated his effort upon election to the Speakership. He promises that the Democratic party, if given control of the House, will send a new tariff bill to the Republican Senate which will reduce the duties upon many of the necessaries, particularly woollen cloth.

During the winter and early spring the election of a Democratic majority of the next House seemed very probable, on account of the dissensions in the Republican party arising from the Ballinger-Pinchot controversy, the apparent inability of President Taft to press Republican measures through Congress, and the public outcry against the Payne-Aldrich tariff act. The adjournment of Congress, however, saw most of the Taft measures enacted into law; the Ballinger-Pinchot quarrel subsided somewhat; the tariff act replenished the Treasury; and the Republicans, under Roosevelt and Taft, began a vigorous campaign for the return of Republican members to the House. The Democratic hope that Roosevelt and Taft would fall out was not realized. So, at the beginning of the Congressional campaign, the prospect of Champ Clark's election to the Speakership was not as bright as it had been during the winter and spring.

IRA E. BENNETT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# A SOLUTION OF THE LABOR PROBLEM.

BY CLIFFORD HOWARD.

FIFTEEN years ago there came from the Government Printing Office a public document bearing the pregnant title "A Solution of the Labor Problem." It was published under the auspices of the United States Senate; yet notwithstanding the publicity and the quasi-official endorsement thus given it, it attracted at the time but scant measure of appreciative attention. True it is that Gladstone, Herbert Spencer, Benjamin Harrison, T. V. Powderly and a score of other notable men of the day passed favorable comment upon it in personal letters to its author; but while acknowledging its worth and its possibilities, they realized that, like Spinoza's "*Tractus Politicus,*" it was an agency born out of time. The proposed measure, in its call for Federal regulation, savored too strongly of the then fantastic Bellamy to appeal to the smug politics of the day. National laws limiting the hours of work, providing for payment of wages, regulating the sanitary conditions of factories, prohibiting child labor, defining employers' liabilities, and other present-day measures of like paternal character, were not then dreamed of by the rank and file of American voters.

There was in those days no accredited prophet to herald the coming of the hour when these same voters would enthusiastically uphold the hands of an administration that should inaugurate reforms such as these and advocate, moreover, the control of private corporations by the National Government. None the less, in the swift on-move of political enlightenment, that hour is now come, and many of the ideas that a few short years ago were the exclusive property of Populism are now being universally discussed as needed public measures. May it not be, therefore, that under the present changed conditions this "Solution of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labor Problem" shall be found worthy of another and more considerate hearing?

Great, indeed, and in many ways remarkable, have been the strides in our economic progress during the past decade and a half. But notwithstanding this day of better things, there is yet no peace 'twixt capital and labor. The labor problem is still with us; a cankerous thorn in the flesh. Unsolved and unbettered, it is growing steadily more intricate, more discouraging, more menacing. Whatsoever, therefore, lies to hand as a possible remedy cannot in this hour of honest desire for civic betterment be righteously ignored. And the "Solution" here to be presented, Utopian though it may seem,—after the fashion of all social reforms in their initial presentment,—may none the less prove worthy of admittance to the councils of men.

To state it briefly and at once, the proposed solution of the problem is the establishing by the Federal Government of *a national unit of value for labor.* Based upon this unit, the wages for all classes of labor shall be automatically regulated by law. In other words, the wages for any given work shall be determined, not by employer or employee, but by an established table of rates builded upon a fixed unit of value for labor.

In order to facilitate business and preserve peace, the State has been obliged to create national units of value for money, weight, measure and time. And for the same imperative reason it should establish a unit of value for labor, and thereby place employer and employee upon the same impartial, neutral footing with regard to wages as they now enjoy with respect to the constitution of a mile or a week or a dollar.

The existing chronic struggle between capital and labor is a contest to decide whether rates of wages shall be determined by the business necessities of the employer or by the life necessities of the employee. And experience has proven ten thousand times over that it is a contest which, upon this basis, can never be settled. Co-operation, arbitration, trade-unionism and all the other attempted methods of reconciliation have shown themselves to be at best but uncertain makeshifts. Despite all legislative prescriptions and despite the earnest efforts for peace on the part of the contestants themselves, strikes, violence, rioting and the many smaller but no less pestilent fruits of this immedicable disagreement between capital and labor continue to contribute

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more or less abundantly to the daily animation of our news columns, and will continue to do so just so long as the issue remains what it is to-day and what it has been since the days of the Pharaohs—whether the pay for labor shall be regulated by the wishes of the workman or by the wishes of the employer.

It is an issue inherently false and unyielding. It rests upon a false economic premise. That the laborer's hire is dependent upon the grace or the financial ability of the man who employs him is an industrial dogma as time-worn and fallacious as the belief in the righteousness of slavery. Under present-day conditions servant and master stand related as political equals. The State imposes like duties of citizenship upon them both. Nay, more, through obligatory education and other compulsory requirements, it compels the laborer as well as the capitalist to maintain a certain grade of civilization. And after thus forcing its prescribed social conditions upon him the State cannot justly neglect its paramount duty of enabling the laborer to secure, independently of the wishes of the employer, such wages as will enable him to meet the demands of those life necessities which the State has itself created. The remuneration for his work, therefore, must be based upon his own life necessities and not upon the business needs of the man or corporation that employs him.

On the other hand, also, it is no less fallacious to contend that the employer shall be subject to the dictates of labor or be compelled to regulate his affairs in accordance with the capricious demands of his employees. To put into the hands of the working-class the power to regulate wages would result as perniciously as has the undisputed exercise of this power in times past by the employers of labor. As matters stand now, however, each side claims this authority: the one as a traditional, prescriptive right, and the other as a prerogative born of modern conditions. It is in trade-unionism that this new-claimed prerogative—this latter-day assault upon the dictatorship of capital—finds its most powerful expression; and therefore it is that trade-unions, having for their cardinal object the dictating of terms in accordance with the necessities and wishes of the employee, naturally and unavoidably excite the hostility of the employer, with whom it remains an axiom that rates of wages must be calculated in accordance with *his* necessities and wishes.

It is obvious, therefore, that such antagonistic ideas, arising as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they do from wholly opposite views, can never be reconciled, however much the contestants may themselves desire it. Consequently, no matter how thorough the defeat or victory in a strike or boycott, the result, even to the winners, is only at great loss of time, money and trade interests, and without any lasting settlement of the big question at issue. At best, the ensuing peace is but a temporary truce, a mere armed neutrality, which either party must break, even against its own inclinations, regardless of pledges or agreements, whenever mutations in business or changes in the cost of living once more arouse the slumbering disaffection.

The State may not properly favor either side as against the other nor refuse them like protection. In the event of a rupture, its only function is the maintenance of public peace; a function, however, whose exercise more often spells terrorism than it does tranquillity. Our Federal Government enjoys the option, backed by men and gunpowder, of preventing two foreign nations from engaging in conflict, while at the same time it stands helpless in the face of a threatened industrial conflict within our own borders, albeit realizing full well that such conflict is ever charged with the possibilities of wreck and bloodshed and financial havoc. And because of this ceaseless antagonism between capital and labor, which no existing law is competent to remedy, thousands and tens of thousands of innocent persons are in constant danger of loss or hurt, and thriving communities are brought ever and again to the verge of anarchy and business paralysis. That the happiness and prosperity of the people and the safety of the commonwealth should be thus continually imperilled because two classes are at feud over a question they can never agree upon is something the law of self-preservation emphatically forbids. And as the disputants have had innumerable opportunities to settle finally what is now proven to be an irreconcilable difference, it is evident that nothing remains but to forbid either side from henceforth having any voice in the matter.

As it does not lie with one side or the other to dictate how many minutes shall make an hour, so likewise it should be beyond the control of either party to fix the wages for any specified class of work. As before suggested, it is a matter to be determined impersonally and automatically, and this only can be done by the establishment of a national unit of value for labor, upon which all wages shall be computed with the same universality of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

application as now inheres in the established tables of weights and measure. Necessarily, such a unit of value for labor must be not only a fixed entity in relation to rates of wages, but must at the same time be susceptible of accommodation to economic changes, so that the money value of wages shall keep pace with fluctuations in the cost of living. It follows, therefore, that the unit upon which the Federally established table of wages shall be built must be chosen with respect to some commodity that is so universally used and of so far-reaching an influence that its market price indexes and measures the cost of living in all walks of life.

Such a commodity is wheat flour. From the earliest days of social history its price has been the key-note to the price of every other necessary of life. Whether due to general causes or to causes pertaining to itself alone, it will be found that *normal* fluctuations in the price of flour are closely preceded or ultimately followed by corresponding changes in the cost of all other staples. It is not contended that the ratio is at all times exactly or even closely maintained, for certain local and adventitious factors will often disturb it; but taking it the country over, from year to year, the ratio does remain approximately constant, or, at all events, sufficiently so for the purpose at present in view.

A careful though not wholly exhaustive inquiry, extending over a period of twenty-five years, would indicate that he who performs the least skilled manual work requires an amount of pay equal to the cost of sixty pounds in bulk of the best grade of family flour. That is to say, the market price of this quantity of flour represents the daily cost of living to him who digs cellars, chops wood, carries a hod, wheels a barrow or does any labor calling for the least mental effort and lowest mechanical skill. Therefore (assuming this calculation to be correct), sixty pounds of wheat flour would constitute a true national unit of value for labor. As our system of linear measure is built upon a national unit of value composed primarily of "three barley corns, round and dry, laid end to end," so would our system of wages be built upon this far more logical unit of sixty pounds of wheat flour.

This proposed unit of value for labor, which we will call a *wage,* would be the lowest compensation that could legally be given to an adult for one day's least skilled manual labor. If

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the market price of flour were two cents a pound, the money value of the *wage* (according to the standard here tentatively suggested) would be $1.20, and this would be the pay that such a laborer, representing the foot of the scale, would receive for one day's work. In other words, this would constitute the measure by which the compensation for all grades of labor would be computed; as, for example, he whose grade of work commands half again as much as the day laborer's would receive $1.80; the skilled mechanic, three integers removed, $3.60, and so on. If flour were three and a half cents a pound, the value of the *wage,* or unit, would be $2.10, and all wages would accordingly be one and three-fourths times higher. But a *wage* of $1.20, with flour at two cents a pound, would purchase as much of the necessaries of life as $2.10 with flour at three and a half cents or as $3 with flour at five cents a pound; for as is the normal price of flour so, in general proportion, are the prices of all other commodities, so that no matter what fluctuations occurred in the cost of living the pay of the workman would always have approximately the same purchasing power and thus bear constantly the same relative value to the conditions surrounding him.

As it would be impracticable, in the payment of wages, to follow the weekly or monthly variations in the price of flour, the average daily quotations during a half or a whole year could be adopted as the governing price for the following six or twelve months. This, however, is one of the many details that would necessarily demand adjustment in the application of the plan here presented, and it does not lie within the scope of the present article to enter into a discussion of these subordinate features, interesting and important though they be.

It would be as easy to build up from the single *wage* a wage table of values for all superior grades of labor, as it has been to construct from the *second* all the higher divisions of time, or from the *grain* all the greater measures of weight; for the proportional values at present accorded the various grades of labor may be accepted as practically correct. And tables of wages once established would seldom require revision, since the relative standing of industrial pursuits alters very slowly. The number of wages, by the day, week or month, accorded to each grade of industry would thus remain constant, while the pay that they would yield would depend upon the market price of flour, and hence

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would vary in accordance with national economic conditions and be thus automatically controlled by the general cost of living.

And what is here said with reference to the *employee* in the matter of the regulated adjustment of his income to economic circumstances applies with equal force and for the same reason to the employer also. While an advance in the price of flour would increase the cost of labor, it would at the same time be accompanied by higher prices for industrial outputs and by correspondingly larger returns upon investments and commercial enterprises, so that the means to meet an advance in wages would be as necessarily forthcoming as the maintenance of the earth's balance with the sun.

This, then, in brief outline, is the proposed solution of the labor problem. Its author, William Howard, a political economist of no small reputation in his day, devoted many years of his life in an effort to gain a sympathetic hearing for this original and promising idea; but, like many another reformer, he pioneered too far in advance of the public procession. Therefore, the resurrecting from obscurity of this contribution to the solving of our industrial plague has seemed to the present writer no more than an act of justice to the memory of its author, as well as to the men of to-day who are seeking guidance in the betterment of human conditions. Theoretically, at all events, this "Solution" holds out a promise which cannot but appeal to the present-day temper of the public in its desire for industrial peace. What is claimed for it by its author, and the results which the proposition itself logically suggests, may be thus summarized:

A national unit of value for labor will automatically adjust wages agreeably to the laws of finance and trade without the intervention of either employer or employee.

It will at all times enable the employee to support the grade of civilization to which his labor belongs.

It will abolish strikes, lockouts and boycotts, as well as the necessity for labor-unions and boards of arbitration.

It will prevent the employee from being subjected in his wages to the employer's incapacity, recklessness, misfortune, trickeries or dishonesty; but will subject him only to those business vicissitudes which arise from the general financial and commercial condition of the nation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It will benefit employers by placing them all on the same level with respect to wages to be paid for similar services.

It will relieve the employer from the dictation, threats, exactions, strikes and boycotts of labor organizations.

It will enable him to estimate with reasonable certainty the prospective worth of enterprises that are dependent chiefly upon industrial labor.

It will provide him with a wider and more profitable market for his wares, merchandise and services, because of a more equitable distribution of the national wealth among the masses, upon whose purchasing power chiefly rest the success and prosperity of our industries.

It will impel him to act honestly in his business relations, as he may not count upon reducing wages in order to sustain watered stock and swollen bonded debts or in order to make good his losses at business gambling.

It will promote the welfare of both employer and employee by putting an end to the iniquitous speculating in wheat and other necessaries of life; for, if wages are based upon the price of flour, the self-interest of either party will prevent any tampering with normal market conditions.

And, lastly, it will work to the general welfare of the nation by *regulating incomes to the cost of living*. High prices will produce automatically correspondingly higher incomes. Instead of measuring a salary by the present gold standard, which is subject to depreciation as exemplified in the distressing conditions of to-day, it will be measured by the actual cost of living and thereby enable it constantly to maintain its full purchasing power.

CLIFFORD HOWARD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THE COLLEGE, THE GIRL AND THE PARENT.

BY MARION TALBOT.

THE story of the struggle of young womanhood against the arbitrary and artificial restraints of society is an old one, but not much thought or pity has been given to it in the past. The world has uttered many a word of scorn and contempt for those young women who have sought wider scope for their activities and proven unequal to the struggle. It has given belated praise to its rare Elizabeths or Joans and lauded them as saints or heroines. Through the centuries the struggle has gone on, but only in late years has there come some realization of the human problem involved and some glimmering of the significance to human welfare of allowing every member of the race, regardless of sex, the fullest and freest expression.

The cry has gone forth from time to time. History and literature alike testify to the struggle. One of the most striking appeals in behalf of young womanhood is that of Charlotte Brontë which she makes through her heroine, Caroline Helstone in "Shirley":

> "I believe single women should have more to do—better chances of interesting and profitable occupation than they now possess. . . . The girls in this neighborhood have no earthly employment but household work and sewing; no earthly pleasure but an unprofitable visiting; and no hope, in all their life to come, of anything better. . . . The fathers observe their manœuvres (for husbands); they order them to stay at home, to sew and cook. They expect them to do this, and this only, contentedly, regularly, uncomplainingly, all their lives long, as if they had no germs of faculties for anything else: a doctrine as reasonable to hold, as it would be that the fathers have no faculties but for eating what their daughters cook or for wearing what they sew.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> "Seek for your daughters an interest and an occupation which shall raise them above the flirt, the manœuvrer, the mischief-making

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tale-bearer. Keep your girls' minds narrow and fettered—they will still be a plague and a care, sometimes a disgrace to you; cultivate them—give them scope and work—they will be your gayest companions in health, your tenderest nurses in sickness, your most faithful prop in age."

Not long ago a prominent physician, president of an active and influential civic organization of men, in addressing a group of women assembled to consider the desirability of organizing a Women's City Club, described in vivid language the host of well-trained and energetic girls just out of college, eager to use their powers and yet hedged in by social conventions and arbitrary restrictions. He portrayed on the one hand the wide range of civic and social work needing the sympathetic and wise co-operation of such young women and on the other hand the piteous waste and tragic loss involved in the failure to give these eager young souls an opportunity to join in the work of the world worthy of their ability and their ideals. From his professional experience he testified also to the physical and nervous wreckage resulting from the chafing against the bars of so-called social proprieties or from the attempt to give expression to executive ability, intellectual power, and social gifts through the vapid and meaningless potherings of society.

Since Miss Brontë wrote there have been many changes in the life of women, notably in opportunities for intellectual enrichment, in domestic industries, in vocational employments open to women and in the social standing given to unmarried women.

In nearly every civilized land not only the elementary and secondary schools are open to girls, but the colleges, universities, professional and even technical schools admit them with more or less freedom to all the courses offered. It is recognized that "woman, having received from her Creator the same intellectual constitution as man, has the same right to intellectual culture and development."

Domestic industries which formerly made the home a centre of production with the woman directing the processes have now gone into factories. The effort to retain them as a means of utilizing the energy of women does not commend itself to the woman of economic instinct. The factory-made flour is not only better, but in every real sense cheaper than the home-ground meal and the same is increasingly true of many articles of food and clothing. The well and the bucket, the brick oven and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MEEING CARNEGIE LIBRARY



spit-iron, the tinder-box and the tallow candle, the spinning-wheel and the loom, the mortar and the pestle, the soap-kettle and even the needle and the scrubbing-brush, have given way under the improvements made possible by modern mechanical inventions. Those who exalt the importance of woman's work within the home and lament that women are not content to remain at home to do it ignore the fact that there is comparatively little of it left to be done. Even many of the elements of education, the sanitary control, the supplying of reading and amusements,—the interests which formerly called for her most intelligent and her constant endeavor, have now in large measure passed into other and usually more competent and better-trained hands.

The time and strength of women which have been set free as the result of changes in the industrial system, mechanical improvements and the socialization of many interests which were formerly carried on solely within the home, are finding chance for expression in a wide range of civic, philanthropic and social activities. These new duties and opportunities are concerned not merely with the well-being of the community as a whole, but with every individual household in the group. They are assuming more and more a professional or technical character demanding special gifts and careful training, both general and specific. When added to the professions and industrial pursuits which have been gradually claiming the interest of women it is clear that the disappearance of domestic activity does not by any means imply idleness other than that enforced by the indolence of the individual or by the restrictions set up by the family and friends.

"Old maid" is no longer a term of opprobrium and scorn. Higher ideals of marriage and the increase in the economic independence of women which, in the words of a conservative English economist, "strengthens their position in what to most of them seems the principal bargain in life" (marriage) have brought about a radical change in the popular estimate of the woman who remains unmarried, in most cases, undoubtedly, of her own choice.

In the light of such considerations as these it is worth while to give serious attention to a problem which is involved in the education of women, and which in the judgment of many educators has passed beyond the personal domain and become a matter of public concern. In former times the relation of the daughter to her parents and particularly to her father was one of de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pendence and submissive obedience. With her new intellectual attainment her wider outlook upon life and her greater consciousness of her powers and more eager desire to use them, there has arisen a new situation. The parents are frequently unable to cope with it or even to understand it and the young woman often finds herself quite powerless to shape her course in a way satisfactory either to her parents or to herself.

A more detailed analysis of the conditions may reveal more clearly what the difficulties are and possibly indicate some means of solving or even of preventing them.

In the first place it should be pointed out that as the problem is one which affects the young woman in her home relations it does not concern all young college women. There are many young girls, although not as many proportionately as in former years, who, when they go to college, have no family ties or whose families openly recognize that under the pressure of pecuniary need the family relations must inevitably be subordinated to the demands of making a living, and may even have to be ignored entirely. In such cases there is little occasion for comment. The young woman looks upon her college course as a means of earning a livelihood and of lightening the family burden by providing for her own self-support. She then enters upon a work which removes her from the family group as completely as if she married and left home and with as little discussion or criticism. An increasingly larger number of girls, however, enter upon their college training with no such future certainly before them. In general these girls may be divided into two large classes—first, those who are entirely free from economic pressure and who are given four years of life in college for the sake of the pleasure and social experience as well as for the more extended education, and, second, those who cannot look upon their college training as a mere intellectual and social indulgence, but will be expected to make some practical use of it in after years.

In like manner the attitude of the parents to the daughter may be described roughly as belonging to two types, although the types do not correspond to the two classes of girls but more or less overlap. In one type of family there is intelligent appreciation of the fact that with development, experience, training and maturity there have entered into the daughter's life new factors to be dealt with and that it is still the parental function to enter

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with sympathy and interest into the child's concerns and to take pride and pleasure in opening up opportunities for the exercise of those qualities which it has been the object of the years of training to strengthen. In such families no real problem presents itself except when an exceptionally selfish nature on the part of the girl, fostered by indulgence and weakness on the part of the parents, makes exactions from them which are utterly unreasonable. As a rule the intelligent daughter is ready to contribute at least her share to the well-being of the group as a whole and of her parents individually while the parents on their side recognize the wrong that lies in the attempt to merge the daughter's individuality completely in the life of the group.

The other type of parents may be subdivided into two classes —first, those who through ignorance and, second, those who through selfishness expect and demand from the daughter on the completion of her college course the entire abandonment of her personal interests, the abnegation of her individual judgment and desires. It is here that the problem exists whose solution demands the greatest skill and wisdom, if indeed it is ever found, and whose existence bears with it a train of suffering, unhappiness and even tragedy from which parents and daughter suffer alike, often in silence, sometimes, unfortunately, with open rancor.

Before attempting to suggest a method of dealing with the problem it may be well to restate briefly the factors which compose it. On the one hand are the parents who have gladly given to the daughter and sometimes forced upon her the opportunity for a wider training. On the other hand is the daughter with her awakened faculties compelled after the four years of absorbing college interests to reorder her life, to establish new connections and to find an outlet for her activities. She finds in her parents what she recognizes as an unduly exalted pride in her attainments and achievements, either complete ignorance, through lack of personal experience, of what the college training really signifies to her, or a more or less frankly expressed sense of relief that "now the college course is over she can settle down at home and be of some use there." She can at last justify the father's desire for "conspicuous consumption" by adding to his entourage a daughter with leisure to spend on personal attractiveness or in acquiring social prestige. She can relieve the mother's burdens by taking her place occasionally in household and social matters. Her ex-



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

penses are cheerfully paid provided they are of moderate amount. She takes turn about with her mother in doing the marketing or ordering or preparing the meals, she is given partial control over the younger children and possibly the servants, but always with the realization that her mother as the actual mistress of the household may at any time step in and overrule her decisions. The third factor in the problem is the circle of friends and acquaintances who look with some degree of awe and reverence on the girl and her achievements, sometimes place her metaphorically upon a pedestal and yet are free in their criticism and harsh in their judgment if she shows any evidence that she has added capacity or different ideals as a result of her absence from the home town. There is forthwith a widely expressed opinion that a college education simply results in educating a girl "out of her sphere" and that she and everybody else would be very much happier if she did not know so much more than her family and her neighbors.

A few cases drawn from real life will serve to illustrate more clearly the difficulties which have been suggested and the problem involved.

A prosperous but not educated farmer has allowed his three daughters to go through the State University. They have strong, vigorous bodies and alert minds. Every law of hygiene demands that both body and mind should be given the exercise for which they have been fitted. The family have moved from the country into a small town and the father has retired from active labor and is engaged in husbanding his goodly store of property. The household is run on the frugal principles to which the parents have become habituated during their years of struggle. The women of the town find their chief interests outside of their kitchens in discussing the latest styles of dress as shown in the fashion-books or in so-called "women's columns." A woman's club, at which papers on Dickens or Longfellow are read, showy but unmusical "pieces" are given with instrument or voice, and elaborate refreshments are served, is the only form of social organization outside of the church which is open to women. It is not considered good form for young ladies of the upper circles to engage in any athletic sports or exercise more vigorously than to take an occasional drive in a carriage. Bridge whist is the all-absorbing amusement and a knowledge of the latest arts of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the hairdresser or skin doctor is a *sine qua non* for success in polite society. The daughters are baffled by the situation. The father forgets that they are grown women and in his old-time imperious manner dictates the hours for their rising and bed-going, sees no reason for their having any money to spend since he is satisfying all their real needs, looks askance on any young men whom they may chance to meet, urges them to help with the cooking and take pride in sweeping the porch, and tells them, when they suggest taking advantage of the town's new water and sewerage system and having a bath-room put in the house, that "what has been good enough for your mother and me is good enough for you." The mother meanwhile has not lost her power of understanding, and as a means of furnishing her girls some outlet for their ability, in rather a furtive way allows them to assume the charge of the housekeeping. They are given an allowance on which to run the household. But their imagined liberty proves to be a chimera. Their purchases of food are never entirely satisfactory and the climax of the situation is reached when they are severely rebuked for spending money for the purchase of new table linen when the old might still have been darned and patched a few more times. In open but quiet revolt they leave home to seek their fortunes, and the father and mother with shaking of the head and doubtless some throbbing of the heart settle down in quiet in the old ways, while the gossips of the town sympathize with them and have little but contumely for their eccentric children.

The daughter of a man in very moderate circumstances has alternately taught and studied and has finally been given a year's leave of absence which she has spent in specializing in her favorite subject, Latin, and in securing her degree. She has received offers of two positions. One is to take the principalship of the school in which she has lately taught. The salary is a thousand dollars, she is to succeed a Harvard graduate and she will be within such distance of her home that she can make a weekly visit. The work is not only uncongenial, but so hard and exacting that it was given up by the man largely on that account, and she foresees that if she undertakes it she will not only be very unhappy, but at the end of a few years be physically and nervously exhausted. Her father, however, thinks that she should accept the position not only for the reasons that the salary is high and that it is a great distinction to succeed a man, but because she will be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enabled to come to him whenever he needs her. This point especially he urges with a force which appeals strongly to her deep affection for him. The other position at a salary of eight hundred dollars is to teach Latin only, with fewer hours of work a day and less responsibility, with the probability that she would have an opportunity to go on with her studies and to be called to more remunerative positions later. The distance from home is such that she would not be able to return except at very rare intervals. She believes that her father is engrossed in his affairs and does not really need her, but that in years to come when his vigor fails she must be ready to give him comfort and support, and for this she will need to husband her own strength. Her only sister has after years of struggle refused longer to accept her father's will as the final arbiter of her life and has left home. Such another break is abhorrent to the girl. She faces these alternatives,—decision which will ultimately give herself and her father the greatest satisfaction or an acquiescence in his judgment which will bring outward peace for the present and for as long as she is willing to yield to his decisions, which are likely to grow more exacting and frequent as he grows older and less vigorous.

Many other cases might be cited. Each would seem to have its individual aspects and be a problem by itself needing its own peculiar solution, unless one were content to generalize to the extent of saying that if the principle of filial obedience, or filial reverence or filial affection, were given its proper recognition and applied regardless of all other considerations, no problem at all would exist. But no one is able to take so extreme a view at the present time, and indeed it is not necessary. There is one factor that is common to all the cases and that is the ignorant parent, for, after all, selfishness in these cases may be explained as the result of ignorance. And the solution rests with the elimination of ignorance on the part of the parent.

It is just here that a mistaken policy on the part of those responsible for the methods of the school has too often prevailed. It is trite to say that the school and the family do not co-operate with sufficient sympathy and intelligence, and yet the effort is not always made. How often one hears such remarks as "if only we did not have to bother with the parents we could accomplish something," or "if only there weren't a father and mother something could be made of the child." But certainly when it comes to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

students of college age the great wonder of those engaged in administrative work is that in most cases there is no chance to deal with the parents at all except in most superficial and general matters. The absolute confidence with which the average parent turns over his child to a college is startling. When a puzzling case demands the special attention of a college officer he often longs to have the interest if not the wisdom of the parents. A knowledge of home conditions and traditions would throw light in dark places, and yet it is often impossible to make the connection with the parent. There are in general two reasons for this. It is a striking fact familiar to those engaged in the collegiate movement that a very large number of college girls are daughters of parents who have had very limited education of a formal character. They look upon the college with awe and regard the college officers with reverence. They have no background of experience to use in bringing them into close and advisory relations with their daughters and the new life. And, of course, the lapse of time simply means a still smaller power to co-operate actively in the new educational process.

Other parents turn over their children to the college because of indifference or absorption in other interests. The result in all of these cases is likely to be that which has already been described. The parent is quite at a loss to know what his child needs and the process of adjustment is one of irritation and disappointment on both sides.

There is, however, no reason why an attempt should not be made by the college authorities first to secure at least the interest if not the intelligent co-operation of the parents throughout the daughter's career in college, and second to encourage her to gratify her parents in any interest they may show in her activities, even though it may not be immediately helpful, and to do all in her power to make them feel that in giving her the new opportunities they have a deep and vital concern in the outcome. Every college officer feels a thrill of delight and a new sense of his responsibility after an interview with a parent who, however timid and self-depreciatory, recognizes that in spite of his educational shortcomings he can by co-operation with the college authorities make a direct contribution towards his daughter's welfare. Although at first thought it may not seem to be the fact, this view of the parental relation is actually in accord with the opinion

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commonly held by experienced college educators, that college students are not to be treated as irresponsible children, but as young folk approaching maturity and profiting by the experience of acting according to their own judgment. The help of the parent is not to be sought as a means of securing dogmatic authority, but as a source of sympathy and co-operation.

As the circumstances and the needs vary with individual cases, it is futile to lay down any specific lines of procedure. General principles may, however, be recognized. In the first place, it is the duty of the college to strengthen, not to destroy or even to weaken, the family tie. Every possible social and educational influence should be called upon to develop the lasting virtues of the family relation, although many of its attributes, once prized, now outworn and useless, are rapidly disappearing. In the second place, the natural and rational method of maintaining the interest of the parent is to have the child encouraged or perhaps compelled to formulate some acceptable reason for taking a college course and incidentally to plan for her future life. In most cases the parent will accompany the child step by step in sympathy and understanding, and, instead of having a wide and almost impassable gulf between them, as too often happens when the college course is finished, both parents and child will then find that although their activities may take different forms, they remain close together in spirit and mutual understanding. The daughter will find herself a truly essential factor in the home life and, on the other hand, the parents will rejoice that in spite of their waning powers they can still be vitally in touch with interests that appeal to them.

MARION TALBOT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THE SOUL OF GOLF.

BY P. A. VAILE.

NEARLY every one who writes about a game essays to prove that it is similar to "the great game, the game of life." Golf has not escaped, and numberless scribes in endeavoring to account for the fascination of golf have used the old threadbare tale. As a matter of fact, golf is about as unlike the game of life as any game could well be. As played now it has come to be almost an exact science, and everybody knows exactly what one is trying to do. This would not be mistaken for a description of the game of life. In that game a man may be hopelessly "off the line," buried "in the rough," or badly "bunkered," and nobody be the wiser. It is not so in golf. There is no double life here. All is open, and every one knows what the player is striving for. The least deflection from his line, and the onlooker knows he did not mean it. It is seen instantly. In that other game it may remain unseen for years, forever.

Explaining the fascination of anything seems to be a thankless kind of a task, and in any case to be a work of supererogation. The fascination should be sufficient. Explaining it seems almost like tearing a violet to pieces to admire its structure; but many have tried, and many have failed, and there are many who do not feel the fascination as they should, because they do not know the soul of golf. One cannot appreciate the true beauty of golf unless one knows it thoroughly.

Curiously enough, many of our best players are extremely mechanical in their play. They play beautiful and accurate shots, but they have no idea how or why they produce them; and the strange thing about it is that although golf is, perhaps, as mechanical a game as there is, those who play it mechanically only get the husk of it. They miss the soul of the game.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Golf is really one of the simplest of outdoor games, if not, indeed, the simplest, and it does not require much intelligence; yet it is quite one of the most difficult to play well, for it demands the greatest amount of mechanical accuracy. This, on consideration, is apparent. The ball is the smallest ball we use, the striking face of the club is the smallest thing used in field sports for hitting a ball, and, most important, perhaps, of all, it is farther away from the eye than any other ball-striking implement, except, perhaps, the polo-stick, in which game we, of course, have a much larger ball and striking surface.

In all games of skill, and in all sports where the object is propelling anything to a given point, one always tries, almost instinctively, to get the eye as much in a line with the ball or missile and the objective point as possible. This is seen in throwing a stone, aiming a catapult, a gun or an arrow, in cuing at a billiard-ball, and in many other ways, but in golf it is impracticable. The player must make his stroke with his eye anywhere from four to six feet away from his little club face. One may say that this is so in hockey, cricket, and lawn-tennis. So, in a modified degree, it is, but the great difference is that in all these games there is an infinitely larger margin of error than there is in golf. At these games a player may be yards off his intended line and yet play a fine stroke, to the applause of the onlookers; while he alone knew that it was accident and not design.

The charm of golf is in part that its demand is inexorable. It lays down the one path—the straight one. It must be followed every step, or there is trouble.

Then there is in golf the sheer beauty of the flight of the ball, and the almost sensuous delight that comes to the man who created that beauty, and knows how and why he did it. There is almost at any time beauty in the flight of a golf-ball well and plainly driven, but for grace and poetry of flight give me the wind-cheater that skims away from one's club across the smooth green sward, almost clipping the daisies in its flight, ere it soars aloft with a swallow-like buoyancy, and curving gracefully, pitches dead on the green.

Many a man can play that stroke. Many a man does. Not one in fifty knows how he puts the beauty into his stroke. Not one in fifty would be interested if you were to start telling him the scientific reason for that ball's beautiful flight. The mechanics

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of golf sound hard and unromantic, yet the man who does not understand them suffers in his game, and in his enjoyment of it. That wind-cheater was to him, during its flight through the air, merely a golf-ball; a golf-ball 'twas and nothing more. To the other man it is a faithful little friend sent out to do a certain thing in a certain way, and all the time it is flying and running it is sending its message back to the man who can take it—but how few can! They do not know what the soul of golf means. So, when our golfer pulls or slices his ball badly, and then—does the usual thing, he cannot take the message that comes back to him. He only knows the half of golf, and he does not care about the other, because he does not know what he is missing. He is like the man who is fond of music but is tune-deaf. There are many such. He may sit and drink in sweet sounds and enjoy them, but he misses the linked sweetness and the message that comes to his more fortunate brother who has the ear—and the knowledge.

There is in England a curious idea that directly one acquires a scientific knowledge of a game one must cease to have an interest in it so full as he who merely plays it by guesswork. There can be no greater mistake than this. If a game is worth playing well, it is worth knowing well, and knowing it well cannot mean loving it less. It is this peculiar idea that has put England so much in the background of the world's athletic field of late years. We have here much of the best brawn and bone in the world, but we must give the brain its place. Then will England come to her own again.

England is in many ways paying now for her lack of thoroughness in athletic sports. Time was when it was a stock jibe at John Bull's expense that he spent most of his time making muscle and washing it. Then it was, I am afraid, sour grapes. England had all the championships. The joke is "off" now. The grapes are no longer sour. The championships are well distributed throughout the world—anywhere but in England; and we say it does not matter, that the chief end of games is not winning them. Nor is it; but we did not talk like that when we were winning them, and the trouble is not so much that we are losing, as the manner in which we are losing. The fact is that we are losing because our players do not know the soul of the game. Where is the soul of English cricket? Ask Lilley. He was the only Englishman who had any of it about him during the last test at Lord's,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As it is with cricket so it is with many of our games. The ideal is lost in the prosaic grappling for cups or medals, in the merely vulgar idea of success. Thus it comes to pass that many will not be content to get to the soul of a game in the natural way, by long and loving familiarity with it.

Hordes of people are joining the ranks of the golfers, and their constant cry is, "Teach me the swing," and after a lesson or two at the wrong end of golf, for a beginner, they go forth and cut the country into strips and think they are playing golf. Is it any wonder that those who have the soul of golf are in imminent daily peril of losing their own?

One who would know the soul of golf must begin even as would one who will know the soul of music. There is no more chance for one to gather up the soul of golf in a hurry than there is for that same one to understand Wagner in a week.

It is this vulgar rushing impatience to be out and doing while one is still merely a nuisance to one's fellows, that causes so much irritation and unpleasantness on many links: that prevents many persons from starting properly, and becoming in due course quite good players; for it is manifest that the "rusher" is starting to learn his game upside down, as, indeed, most professionals and books teach it. There can be no doubt that the right way to teach anything is to give the beginner the easiest task first. About the easiest stroke in golf is a six-inch putt. That is where one should start a learner. The drive is the stroke in golf that offers the greatest possibility of error, so he is always started with it. It is his own fault. "Teach me the swing," is the insistent cry of the beginner, who does not know that he is losing the best part of golf by turning it upside down. He will never enjoy it, not play so good and confident a game, as he would do were he to work his way gradually and naturally from his putter to his mashie, to his niblick, his iron, his cleek, his brassey, and his driver. Such a one may come to an intimate knowledge and love of the game. The rusher may play golf, but it will be a long time before he gets to the soul of the game.

A very good golfer, in reviewing a golf book some time ago, stated that he did not care in the least what happened while the ball was in the air, that all he cared about was getting it there. He has played golf since he was five years old, but he has clearly missed the soul of the game.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is not necessary to dilate upon the wonderful spread of golf throughout the world. An industrious journalist some time ago marked a map of England wherever there was a golf club. It looked as though it had been sprinkled with black pepper. It is not hard to understand this marvellous increase in the popularity of the great game, for golf is undoubtedly a great game. The motor has, unquestionably, played a great part in its development. Many of the courses, particularly in the United Kingdom, are most beautifully situated. Many of the club houses are models of comfort, and some of them are castles. The game itself is suitable for the octogenarian dodderer who merely wants to infuse a little interest into his morning walk, or it may be turned into a severe test of endurance for the young athlete; so no wonder it prospers.

There is a wonderful freemasonry among golfers. This is not the least of the many charms of the game, and to him who really knows it and loves it as it deserves to be loved, the sign of the club is a passport round the world.

Many a time and oft I see golfing journalists, when writing about the game, stating that something "is obvious." It has always seemed to me that it is impossible to say what is obvious to any one in a game of golf. Writing of George Duncan, the famous young professional golfer, during the first half of the great foursome at Burhill, a great sporting paper said that a certain mashie shot was a "crude stroke." The man who wrote that article did not know the soul of golf. He saw a mashie flash in the air, some turf cut away, and a ball flying on to the green. Just that and nothing more, and it was "obvious" to him that it was a crude stroke.

One who knew the soul of golf saw it and described it. It was a tricky green, with a drop of twenty feet behind it. To have overrun it would have been fatal. There was a stiff head-wind. The player would not risk running up. He cut well in under the ball to get all the back-spin he could. He pitched the ball well up against the wind, which caught it and, on account of the spin, threw it up and up until it soared almost over the hole, then it dropped like a shot bird about a yard from the hole, and the back-spin gripped the turf and held the ball within a foot of where it fell. It was obvious to one man that it was a crude shot. It was equally obvious to another, who knew the inner secrets of the game, that it was a brilliantly conceived and beautifully

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

executed stroke. One man saw nothing of the soul of the stroke. He got the husk, and the other took the kernel.

Much has been made of the assumption that golf is the greatest possible test of a man's temperament. This has to a great extent, I am afraid, been exaggerated. It is one of those things in connection with the game that has been handed down to us and which we have been afraid to interfere with. I cannot see why this claim should be quietly granted. In golf a man is treated with tragic solemnity while he is making his stroke. A caddie may not sigh, and if a cricket chirped he would be considered a bounder. How would our golfer feel if he had to play his drive with another fellow waving his club at him twenty or thirty feet away, and standing ready to spoil his shot?—yet that is what the lawn-tennis player has to put up with. There is a good deal of exaggeration about this aspect of golf, even as there is a good deal of nonsense about the interference of onlookers. What can be done by one when one is accustomed to a crowd may be seen when one of the great golfers is playing out of a great "V" formed by the gallery, and, needless to say, playing from the narrow end of it. Golf is a good test of a man's disposition without doubt, but as a game it lacks one important feature which is characteristic of every other field sport, I think, except golf. In these the medium of conflict is the same ball, and the skill of the opposing side has much to do with the chances of the other player or players. In golf each man plays his own game with his own ball, and the only effect of his opponent's play on his is moral, or the luck of a stymie. Many people consider this a defect, but golf is a game unto itself, and we must take it as it is. Certainly it is hard enough to achieve distinction in it to satisfy the most exacting.

When one writes of the soul of golf it sounds almost as though one were guilty of a little sentimentality. As a matter of fact, it is the deadliest of practice that leads one to the soul of golf. Many a good professional can produce beautiful shots, such as the wind-cheater and the pull at will, but he cannot explain them to you, and no professional ever has explained clearly in book or elsewhere what produces these beautiful shots.

A famous professional once asked me quite simply, "How do I play my push-shot, Mr. Vaile?" I explained the stroke to him. He is as good a sportsman as he is a golfer, and would be ashamed to pretend to a knowledge that he has not. When I had told him,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he said, "Thank you. Of course, I can play it all right, but I never could understand why it went like that. Now I shall be able to explain it better to my pupils."

Now it may in some measure sound incongruous, but I repeat that unless one knows the mechanics of golf one has missed the soul of the game. It is simply an impossibility for the blind ball-smiter to get such joy and gratification from his game as does the man who from his superior knowledge has produced results that are in themselves worth losing the game for. Many a golfer, or one who would like to be a golfer, will wonder at this. Many a game at billiards has been lost for the poetry of a fascinating cannon when the win was not the main object of a game; but in this respect billiards and golf are not alike. One is not, in golf, penalized for putting the soul and the poetry of the game into his shots, for they come of practice, and simply render one's strokes more perfect than they would otherwise be. So in the end it will be found that he who knows the game most thoroughly will have an undoubted advantage.

Therefore, it behooves every golfer to strive for the soul of golf.

And now, as we must for a little while leave the soul of golf, let us consider its body, that great, solid, visible portion which is the part that appeals most forcibly to the ordinary golfer. It is this to which the attention of players and writers has been most assiduously directed for centuries, yet it is safe to say that no game in the whole realm of sport has been so miswritten and unwritten as golf.

This is very strange, for probably there is no other game that is so canvassed and discussed by its followers. The reason may possibly be found in the fact that golfers are a most conservative class of people, and that they follow wonderfully the line of thought laid down for them by others. This at its best is uninteresting; at its worst most pernicious.

Another contributing cause is the manner in which books on sport are now produced. A great name, an enterprising publisher, and a hack writer are all that are now required. The consequence is that the market is flooded with books ostensibly by leading exponents of the different sports, but which are, in many cases, written by men who know little or nothing of the subject they are dealing with. The natural result is that the great players suffer severely in "translation," and their names are fre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quently associated with quite stupid statements—statements so foolish that one, knowing how these things are done, refrains from criticising them as they deserve from sympathy with the unfortunate alleged author, who is probably a very good fellow, and quite innocent of the fact that the nonsense alleged to be his knowledge is ruining or retarding the game of many people. This is a most unscrupulous practice that should be exposed and severely condemned, for it must not be thought that it is confined to any one branch of sport.

While we are dealing with the slavish following of the alleged thought of the leading golfers of the world, we may with advantage consider a few of the most pronounced fetiches which have been worshipped almost from time immemorial, fetiches which are the more remarkable in that they receive mental and theoretical worship only, and are, in actual practice, most severely despised and disregarded by the best players; but unfortunately the neophyte worships these fetiches for many years until he discovers that they are false gods.

Perhaps one of the silliest, and for beginners most disastrous, is the ridiculous assertion that putters are born and not made. In the books of a very famous player I find the following words: "It happens, unfortunately, that concerning one department of the game that will cause the golfer some anxiety from time to time, and often more when he is experienced than when he is not, neither I nor any other player can offer any words of instruction such as, if closely acted upon, would give the same successful results as the advice tendered under other heads ought to do. This is in regard to putting."

Now this idea is promulgated in many books. It is, in my opinion, the most absolute and pernicious nonsense. The best answer to it is the fact that the writer of the words was himself one of the worst putters, but that by careful study and alteration of his defective methods, he became a first-class performer on the green. Also it will be obvious to a very mean intelligence that there is no branch of golf which is so capable of being reduced to a mechanical certainty as is putting.

The importance of removing this stupid idea will be more fully appreciated when one remembers that quite half the game of golf is played on the green, leaving the other half to be distributed amongst all the other clubs. It is well to emphasize

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this. A good score for almost any eighteen-hole course is 72. The man who can count on getting down in an average of two is a very good putter. Many professionals would throw away their putters if they were allowed to consider it down in two every time. This gives us 36 for putts. With this before us we cannot exaggerate the pernicious effect of the false doctrine which says that putting cannot be taught, that a man must just let his own individuality have full play, and similar nonsense; whereas the truth is that one might safely guarantee to convert into admirable putters many men who, from their conformation and other characteristics, would be almost hopeless as golfers. I must emphasize the fact that there is no department of the game that is so important as putting; there is no department of the game more capable of being clearly and easily demonstrated by an intelligent teacher, and there is no department of the game wherein the player may be so nearly reduced to that machine-like accuracy which is the constant demand, and no small portion of the charm, of golf.

Another very widely worshipped fetich, which has been much damaged recently, is the sweep in driving a ball. Trying "to sweep" his ball off for two hundred yards has reduced many a promising player to almost a suicidal frame of mind. Fortunately the fallacy soon exasperates a beginner, and he "says things" and "lets it have it." Then the much-worshipped "sweep" becomes a hit, sometimes a very vicious one, and the ball goes away from the club as it was meant to. It is becoming more widely recognized every day that the golf-drive is a hit, and a very fine one—when well played.

Perhaps the most pernicious fetich that has for many years held sway in golf, until recently somewhat damaged, is that the left arm is the more important of the two—that it, in fact, finds the power for the drive. Anything more comical is hard to imagine. There is practically nothing in the whole realm of muscular exertion, from wood-chopping to golf, wherein both arms are used, that is not dominated by the right, yet golfers have for generations quietly accepted this fetich, and it has ruined many a promising player. The votaries of this fetich must surely find one thing very hard to explain. If we admit, for the sake of argument, that the left arm is the more important, and that it really has more power and more influence on the stroke than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the right, can they explain why the left-handed players, who have been provided by a benevolent Providence with so manifest an advantage, tamely surrender it and convert their left hand into the right-handed players' right by giving it the lower position on the shaft? If this idea of the left hand and arm being the more important is correct, left-handed players would use right-hand clubs and play like a right-handed player, with the manifest advantage of being provided by nature with an arm and hand that fall naturally into the most important position. I think that this consideration of the subject will give those who put their faith in the fetich of the left something to explain.

Almost from time immemorial it has been laid down by golfing writers that at the top of the swing the golfer must have his weight on his right leg. A study of the instantaneous photographs of most of the famous players will show conclusively that this is not correct. It is expressly laid down that it is fatal to sway, to draw away from one's ball during the upward swing; the player is specially enjoined on no account to move his head. A very simple trial will convince any golfer, even a beginner, that without swaying, without drawing his head away from the hole, he cannot possibly, if swinging correctly, put his weight on his right leg, and that at the top of his swing *it must be mainly on his left*—and so another well-worn belief goes by the board.

So it is with the exaggerated swing that for so many years dominated the mind of aspiring golfers to such an extent that many of them thought more of getting the swing than of hitting the ball. It is slowly but surely going.

The era of new thought in golf has dawned. It will not make the game less attractive. It will not make it any more exacting, for the higher knowledge cannot become an obsession. It sinks into a man, and he scarcely thinks of it as something beyond the ordinary game. It becomes an integral part of his game. It brings him into closer touch with the best that is in the game. He is able to obtain more from it than he could before. He is able to do more than he could formerly, for a man cannot get to the soul of golf except through the body, and, loves he not the body with the love of the truest of true golfers, he will never know the soul.

P. A. VAILE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# JUST WHAT DOES INDIA WANT POLITICALLY?

BY SAINT NIHAL SINGH.

THAT India is profoundly agitated and that the agitation is almost wholly political are to-day established facts which need no demonstration. Of course it has to be readily conceded that all Hindostan is not in a political ferment; it is only educated India that is agitating for governmental change. The masses may be feeling the pinch of poverty and may be economically distressed, but, as a rule, they are ignorant of the political issues and are not directly engaged in waging a war for securing administrative concessions and reforms from the English. The educated community in India, however, though in the minority when compared with the unlettered masses, is by no means a negligible quantity. For one thing, despite all aspersions, the educated Indians are the natural leaders of their unenlightened countrymen. What the enlightened East-Indian thinks to-day his uneducated confrère is apt to think to-morrow. Moreover, slowly but steadily the ranks of the illiterates are being thinned and those of the educated augmented; and all educated Indians, of whatever religion, caste or race, seem to have one factor in common—a desire for the political advancement of Hindostan. Naturally, it is to-day pertinent to ask: Just what does educated India want politically? The question is all the more appropriate in view of the fact that some of the East-Indians have gone to the length of making and throwing bombs when frenzied because of their political demands not being fairly fulfilled.

Speaking conservatively, every East-Indian capable of reading current literature is more or less an animated being. He is by no means the embodiment of nirvana—the nirvana that is the synonym of death, of ignominious fatalism. Within the



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

breast of this man rages passions. His face may not betray what fights are being fought in his inner consciousness; but do not mistake him to be unconscious or dead. He is alive—very much so. The passions that rage within him are not concerned merely with his individual uplift. Some of them, the more important of them, concern the community, the caste, the denomination if he is narrow-minded, or the nation if he is liberal and wide-horizoned. Invariably this man has political aspirations. The Indian educated community is vibrating with political longings and no East-Indian is minus such desires, no matter how weak and undynamic these longings may be.

Just what does educated India want politically? No single answer is possible. The enlightened Indians are themselves full of vim and energy and they are handling live issues; necessarily, therefore, all of them are not agreed on just what they want politically. A perfect agreement would be indicative of their lack of earnestness, since different elements enter into the personal make-up of the different East-Indians, and these elements, in many cases, are essentially heterogeneous. Furthermore, these men, with their checkered racial pasts and their diversified temperaments, never yet have been subjected to crucial experiences of a terror-striking nature that would merge their individualities into a communal entity. During the last century, at least, no outside attack has threatened their civil life and united them to expel the common foe. Even their home affairs have been handled by an alien people and the Indians have not had the sobering experiences of give and take which are the most pronounced features of political life, and probably the most active agents that coalesce unhomogeneous individuals into a community athrob with the same governmental passions. For these reasons, it is by no means a reflection on the educated Indians to say that they are divided as to their political planks.

Until a short time ago nearly all educated East-Indians were at one as to what they were seeking politically. They aspired to an autonomous India under the ægis of the English. Their highest ambition was to agitate and work to secure for Hindostan the same status in the British Empire that is enjoyed by Great Britain's colonies in various parts of the world. But since Japan's successful fight with Russia, and the consequent Asiatic awakening, the ambitions of some of the educated Indians have com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

menced to soar higher. An important section of enlightened natives now seek not only self-government under the tutelage of the English, but an independent India, governed by and in the interests of its own people, left absolutely unfettered to develop its own national civilization according to its own peculiar tastes and genius. Thus at present there are two political schools in India. Both are aiming for the abolition of the Indian administration as it is to-day conducted—"British Bureaucracy," they aptly term it—and for the installation of a popular rule in the land. But while one division of the political workers, popularly known as "Moderates," demands a representative administration without sundering the country's bonds from the British Empire the other section, the so-called "Extremist," is anxious to work toward the day when it will be possible to contemptuously cast aside the alien crutches upon which the "Moderates" desire to continue leaning forevermore.

While the Extremists wish Hindostan to be rid of the English, they want this sloughing-off process to take its natural course. They are all agreed to use no "unconstitutional" weapons in the fight that is to render the land independent of the Britisher. In fact, they do not at all believe in warfare. It is an evolutionary process that is to enable Hindostan to outgrow the necessity of leaning upon foreign support; and for this reason the use of force or doubtful means to effect the freedom of the country is absolutely interdicted.

There is a division of East-Indians, however, that goes farther than the "Extremist" or "Moderate." This political party is of the faith that England is in Hindostan for the purpose of exploiting it. This section of East-Indians is dead set against the so-called exploitation of the land by the aliens, and since the Britisher, according to their notion, is ruthlessly robbing the country, they advocate the freeing of India by any means, no matter how questionable. In fact, it is considered meritorious to overcome oppression by hook or crook, while non-resistance is denounced. This Indian party makes and throws bombs at the English officials and their relatives and justifies political assassination. East-Indians of such persuasion are called by some "Nationalists" and by others "Nihilists," "Terrorists" and "Anarchists."

Political fanaticism that expresses itself in bomb-throwing is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not an inherent trait in the Hindu. He has been taught by religion and tradition to be the antithesis of the terrorist. Nihilism is something the Hindu has learned from the Occidental. It is only during very recent years that the bomb movement has been inaugurated in Hindostan. Naturally, the number of those who advocate the freeing of their country from the foreign yoke, by any means, fair or foul, is extremely limited.

Even the ranks of those East-Indians who are working by peaceful methods for India's gradual liberation from the grip of the British are not well filled. Whatever the intrinsic merits or demerits of such an ideal, it is necessarily a remote goal, something far removed from the possibilities of the present or even the near future. There is a certain enchantment about this prospect, an allurement that all distant aims possess. For this reason those Indians who are emotionally inclined drift naturally toward this end. But the larger bulk of educated Indians, gifted with an eye for the practical, take for granted the British supremacy in India and bend their efforts toward slowly coming into virtual control of the administration. Such East-Indians, therefore, belong to the "Moderate" party.

Broadly speaking, the religious or racial bias does not deflect the enlightened Indian from entertaining this vision of an autonomous India under British suzerainty. Of course there is a rift between the Hindus and Mahomedans, the two largest sections, which comprise nearly all of the 321,000,000 of East-Indians, the Mahomedan being in the minority, there being four Hindus to every Moslem. While the educated Hindus and Mahomedans have separate political leagues and associations, while they have not come to realize that there exists between them a community of interest, and while they are, therefore, clamoring for preferential political treatment, still both the sects are working toward the same goal—Indian self-government under the ægis of the British. The Hindu may permit himself to be labelled a "Moderate"; the Mahomedan may not countenance being thus tagged; but the political aspirations of the two, upon being closely analyzed, present no material differences—both are anxious for the Indian to come into his own heritage, and, as a general rule, they are not in favor of sundering the British bonds.

In a word, a careful survey of East-Indian aspirations discloses three facts: First, the agitation is not local; it is India

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wide: all provinces in all parts of the country have given birth to the agitator and show unmistakable signs of "unrest." Second, the agitation is not merely one—denominational. It is not the Hindu alone who seeks self-government, but the Mahomedan as well. The way in which the two go about agitating may not be identical; the volume of agitation amongst the two may not measure the same; but it is, nevertheless, true that the Hindu and Mahomedan educated communities alike are desirous of self-government and are fast tending toward that direction. Third, barring a negligible quantity of Indian irreconcilables, all East-Indian politicians are aspiring for self-rule under the protecting wing of Great Britain and they are in favor of working in a peaceful, legitimate manner to secure the desired change in the constitution of their government.

The liberal tendencies of England appear to be in favor of gradually substituting the native in place of the foreign administration of Hindostan. The appointment of a Hindu to the Supreme Executive Council in India, and of one Hindu and one Mahomedan to the Secretary of State for India's Council in England, and the recent enactment of the Indian Councils Bill of 1909, otherwise known as Lord Morley's Reform Scheme, which gives the majorities in the provincial councils of India to East-Indians, and also concedes some effective power in the Supreme Legislative Council of India, are unmistakable evidences of liberal England's desire to sympathetically treat the Indian aspirations for self-government.

While Lord Morley's reform scheme has been gratefully received in India, it very partially fulfils the ambitions of even the "Moderates" who are working for Indian autonomy under British supremacy. It has been accepted as only an initial instalment and not a complete and final fulfilment of the Indian desire for self-government. Educated India's attitude in regard to the changes initiated simply is: "Half a loaf is better than no bread." While this half-loaf has gone some way to allay the political unrest that has been India's characteristic feature during the last few years, it has not removed all the grievances of East-Indians and set their agitation at rest. So long as he does not receive the whole loaf, he will keep up his murmurings.

The Englishman claims that his chariness to install Indians in the highest governmental positions has been inspired by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

kindliest of motives — unselfishness. He professes to shoulder "the white man's burden" in India at great personal sacrifice, and ascribes his hesitancy to let the Indian replace him to the fear that the brown man's inefficiency to wisely manage his estate might involve the people of India in trouble and retard their progress. Actuated by such feelings, hitherto the policy of the English rulers has been to give the highest posts in the government service to their own countrymen and reserve the lower ranks for Indians. There are thirteen hundred and seventy positions carrying annual salaries of more than four thousand dollars. Only ninety-two of these posts are held by natives of India; fifteen of these are held by Eurasians, the rest, twelve hundred and sixty-three, being held by Englishmen. While there are sixty-five hundred Englishmen in the employ of the government in the civil departments and seventy thousand in the military department, there are one million four hundred thousand and one hundred and sixty thousand natives, respectively, in the civil and military departments. But while hundreds of thousands of natives receive a miserable pittance of two dollars or three dollars a month, there is no Britisher who receives less than thirty dollars or forty dollars a month. In fact, despite the largeness of the numbers employed, it is doubtful if the government bill for its native employees equals that of its foreign servants. It is this state of affairs that has brought discontent into existence in India. The only way in which this disaffection can be effectually removed does not lie in admitting East-Indians into the higher governmental appointments through a back door, but in throwing wide open the front gate so that, contrary to the present practice, the majority of the best-salaried positions will be held by the natives of the soil.

The highest posts in the administration not only mean the highest pay, they also mean that their occupants have the highest powers. As it is, all the executive authority is vested in the hands of Englishmen. Considered from the view-point of salary, the natives of India are mere drawers of water and hewers of wood: regarded from the standpoint of exercising control over their own affairs, the Indians are little better than slaves. The laws are made for the people of Hindostan by the English, the natives having a limited share in the lawmaking, even under the neo-Morleyan reform scheme. The taxes are levied on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Indians by the English, the people of India having no voice in the taxation. The finances of Hindostan are spent by the English without the Indians exercising any control over their revenue which they have paid into the government treasury. The Indians do not have anything to say about their tariff. Even the universities of Hindostan are governmental affairs, in which the native is practically unrepresented.

It is the virtual reversal of this state of affairs for which the East-Indian is agitating. Indian autonomy essentially means this: and the agitation in India is fated to continue so long as the majority of the governmental positions carrying the higher salaries and the executive, administrative and financial authority are not held by the natives of the land. Educated Indians urge that they are capable of efficiently discharging the duties connected with the responsible governmental positions. The controversy about Indian autonomy rages around this claim. Plainly interpreted, India's political aspirations mean the substitution of native in lieu of the present-day alien administrative agency, East-Indians not objecting to run their government under the guidance of the British.

To aspire for an object is one thing: to deserve it is another. The question is not alone, "What does India want politically?" but also, "What are its claims for seeking the satisfaction of its political desires?" If the contingency should arrive that Great Britain be willing to give educated Indians just what they are agitating for, would they be able to efficiently manage India's governmental affairs without the co-operation of the English?

A careful examination of the annals of the land is bound to convince a thinking person that this query should be answered in the affirmative. In days gone by Indians possessed admirable genius for administering their governmental affairs. But if it be considered that, through a turn of the wheel of Fate, the natives of Hindostan irredeemably lost the capability for even a *partial* self-rule, it is only necessary to turn to the up-to-date native States of India to find a reply to the question: "Are Indians capable of efficiently filling the higher ranks in the government of British India?"

The State of Baroda will serve as an example, for its ruler, the Gaekwar, is an enlightened and travelled man and intensely interested in the uplift of his subjects. He has associated with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

himself capable Indians to help him advance the interests of those who are under his rule. The State of Baroda is a part of the Central-Indian Agency and has a population of two million, roughly speaking. The revenue of the State amounts to about five million dollars a year. The State is not large, but it is regarded all over India as a model State, for the ruler of Baroda, with the help of his Ministers, has, during recent years, carried out reforms such as separating the judicial from the executive functions; restoring the ancient system of local self-government in the form of the village communities; instituting compulsory primary education throughout the State; reforming the method of electing members of the Legislative Council; raising the age of marriage and consent; founding scholarships for industrial students to be sent abroad; and encouraging agriculture, industries and art.

It is easy to understand why this State is dear to the Indian heart when it is considered that, in introducing these measures, the Gaekwar is not copying the men who administer British India, but, on the contrary, he is setting the pace for the English. In British India the same magistrate has the power to arrest a man and sit in judgment over him—that is to say, the executive and judicial functions are not separated, as is the case in other civilized countries. While in British India the administration expends less than five dollars per one thousand of population for education, the Gaekwar of Baroda spends five dollars on every fifty-five of his subjects. While in British India one out of four villages has a schoolhouse, one million four hundred and eighty-one out of the two million subjects of the Maharajah Gaekwar have within their reach excellent school facilities. While in British India the Englishmen are still engaged in academic discussions regarding the Indians' ability to govern themselves, the Gaekwar has revived the old Hindu custom of government by the village *Panchayat*—village community—and thereby has afforded his people the opportunity to develop their capabilities for self-government by exercising their faculties in that direction.

Besides the reforms mentioned above, a model experimental farm has been established in Baroda. Here experiments are made with artificial manures and others that are locally available in abundance. Seeds of different kinds of cotton, tobacco, oil-seeds and foodstuffs, imported from various countries, are distributed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

free to the agriculturists. This has proved most beneficial both to the cultivators as individuals and the country in general. Travelling instructors are appointed who go from village to village educating farmers in practical agriculture conducted along modern lines, encouraging the agriculturists to give up the old time-worn ways which to-day are found throughout Hindostan. One travelling instructor induced twenty-eight farmers to try forty plots with different crops, and as a result new crops have sprung up in the land which promise to become the staple products of the district. As a result of the agricultural awakening brought about through the efforts of the Gaekwar an agricultural association has been formed. The first agricultural show was held in March, 1907, an exhibition of implements and produce, the result of lessons learned from the Occident combined with the native skill of the Indian cultivator. The cotton-seed oil industry in Baroda is also showing favorable signs of progress.

A sanitary commissioner travels about through Baroda and delivers lectures on various sanitary subjects. Orphanages are conducted by the State and girls and boys, when they reach the marriageable age, are married to members of their caste at the expense of the State. These orphans are taught useful occupations, such as tailoring, carpentry, shoemaking, laundry work, weaving, sewing and drawing. In the different girls' schools of the State, embroidery, drawing, practical cooking and music are taught. In all the schools and kindergartens plain needlework is taught with materials supplied free by the State. Special classes for grown women have been established. These classes are held every afternoon for three hours, and writing, reading, keeping domestic accounts, needlework and embroidery are taught. Special provision is made by the State to give instruction in pictorial art, architecture, mechanics, technology, chemical technology, weaving, watch-making, pedagogy and commercial branches; and an evening school for artisans is accomplishing useful work. Sixty-one ginning factories, two weaving-mills, four dyeing factories, fifteen pumping-stations, one sugar-mill and one State bank have been established in Baroda, largely through the instrumentality of the Maharajah, who is a firm believer in State patronage and encouragement of industries and business.

In addition to inaugurating reforms, the Maharajah Gaekwar of Baroda is an exemplar, and his example, even more than his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beneficent reforms, is inspiring and elevating his people. The Maharajah is the First Gentleman of India and his royal consort, the Maharani, is the First Lady of the Land. She is an emancipated, modernized woman and helps her royal husband in his work for the welfare of the State. With her aid the Maharajah has instituted many social reforms. The seclusion of women has been done away with; the fabric of caste has been nearly torn to pieces. The State of Baroda counts more educated women than the same area in any part of British India.

During the last few years a momentous change has taken place in the character of the educated native. He has grown manly and desirous of depending upon his own initiative. With this end in view, he has commenced to gather together his resources and make a good display of them. He has already established a network of schools and colleges which are run on independent lines, some of them with the aid of the government, many others organized and conducted on the principle of "the gods help those who help themselves." Such scholastic institutions, "National Schools," as they are called, are fast becoming the order of the day and are rapidly gaining in prominence. So well are they distributed in different portions of India, and so ably are they conducted, that they are gaining votaries day by day and are proving a great power in the land.

Social, educational, industrial and political organizations initiated and conducted by the natives of India have for many decades been giving East-Indians increased capability to govern themselves. Tutelage to England, too, must have increased their capacity to administer their own affairs; for the Englishmen have iterated and reiterated that they were in India for the purpose of training the natives to look after their own affairs. A wave of democracy to-day is dashing against the entire Orient, and this of necessity must increase the desire of the East-Indians for an autonomous government. One hundred and sixty-two thousand public and private scholastic institutions are leavening five million five hundred thousand Indian pupils with a desire to rise superior to playing second fiddle to the foreigner. In the past few years the native of India has cast aside his abject, slavish state of mind. To-day the slogan of Hindostan no longer is "Good government," but "Self-government."

SAINT NIHAL SINGH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THE LOGIC OF DREAMS.

BY HAVELOCK ELLIS.

In dreams we are always reasoning. That is a general characteristic of dreams which is worth noting, because its significance is not usually recognized. It is sometimes imagined that reason is in abeyance during sleep. So far from this being the case, we may almost be said to reason much more during sleep than when we are awake. That our reasoning is bad, often even preposterous, that it constantly ignores the most elementary facts of waking life, scarcely affects the question. All dreaming is a process of reasoning. That confusion of ideas and images which may be regarded as the most constant feature of dream mechanism is nothing but a process of reasoning, a perpetual effort to argue out harmoniously the absurdly limited and incongruous data presented to sleeping consciousness. Binet, grounding his conclusions on hypnotic experiments, has very justly determined that reasoning is the fundamental part of all thinking, the very texture of thought.* It is founded on perception itself, which already contains all the elements of the ancient syllogism. For in all perception, as Binet shows, there is a succession of three images, of which the first fuses with the second, which in its turn suggests the third. Now this establishment of new associations, this construction of images, which, as we may easily convince ourselves, is precisely what takes place in dreaming, is reasoning itself.

Reasoning is a synthesis of images suggested by resemblance and contiguity; indeed, a sort of logical vision, more intense even

* "Reasoning," says Binet ("*La Psychologie du Raisonnement*," p. 10), speaking without reference to dreaming, but in words that are exactly applicable to it, "is an organization of images determined by the properties of the images alone; it suffices for the images to be put in presence and they become organized; reason follows with the certainty of a reflex."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than actual vision, since it is capable of producing hallucinations. To reasoning all forms of mental activity may finally be reduced; "mind," as Wundt has said, "is a thing that reasons." Or, as H. R. Marshall puts it, "reason is a mode of instinct." When we apply these general statements to dreams, we may see that the whole phenomenon of dreaming is really the same process of image formation, based on resemblance and contiguity, which is at the basis of reasoning. Every dream is the outcome of this strenuous, wide-ranging instinct to reason. The supposed "imaginative faculty," regarded as so highly active during sleep, is the inevitable play of this automatic logic.

The syllogistic arrangement of dream imagery is carried on in an absolutely automatic manner; it is spontaneous, involuntary, without effort. Sleeping consciousness, though all the time it is weaving the data that reach it into some pattern of reason with immense ingenuity, is quite unaware that it is itself responsible for the arguments thus presented. In the evening, before going to bed, I glance casually through a newspaper; I see the usual kind of news, revolutionists in Russia, Irish affairs, crimes, etc. I see also a caricature of the Liberal Party as a headless horseman on a barren plain. During sleep these unconnected impressions revive, float into dream consciousness and spontaneously fall into as reasonable a whole as could be expected. I dream that by some chemical or mechanical device a man has succeeded in conveying the idea that he is headless, and is preparing to gallop across some district in Russia, with the idea of making so mysterious an impression upon the credulous population that he will be accepted as a great religious prophet. I distinctly see him careering across sands like those of the seashore, but I avoid going near him. Then I see figures approaching him in the far distance, and his progress ceases. I learn subsequently that he has been arrested and found to be an Irish criminal. A coherent story is thus formed out of a few random impressions.

All such typical dreams are syllogistic. There is, that is to say, as Binet expresses it, the establishment of an association between two states of consciousness by means of an intermediate state which resembles the first, is associated with the second, and by fusing with the first associates it with the second. In this dream, for instance, we have the three terms of (1) headless horseman, (2) revolutionary crime and (3) Russia and Ireland. The inter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mediate term, by the fact that it resembles the first and is contiguous in the mind with the third, seems to fuse the first and the third terms, so that the headless horseman becomes an Irish criminal in Russia. In dreaming life as in waking life our minds are always moving by the construction of similar syllogisms, marked by more or less freedom and audacity.

It is unnecessary to multiply examples of the instinctive and persistent efforts on the part of the sleeping mind to construct a coherent whole out of the incongruous elements that come before it; nearly every dream furnishes some proof of this profoundly rooted impulse. It is instructive, however, to consider the nature and the limitations of dreaming reason.

This rationalization and logical construction of imagery, it is necessary to realize, occurs at the very threshold of sleeping consciousness. The dreamer makes no effort to arrange isolated imagery; the arrangement has already occurred when the imagery comes to the focus of sleeping consciousness; so that this reasoning and arranging process is so fundamental and instinctive that it occurs in a region which may be said to be subconscious to dreaming consciousness. If it were not so our dreams would never be real to us, for even dreaming consciousness could not accept as real a hallucination which it had itself arranged. In this sense it is true that, to some extent, our dreams are often based on an ultimate personal and emotional foundation.

But this ingeniously guided and rationalized confusion of imagery by no means covers the whole of the reasoning process in dreams. This is a double process. It is first manifested subconsciously in the formation of dream imagery, and then it is manifested consciously in the dreamer's reaction to the imagery presented to him. Every dream is made up of action and reaction between a pseudo-universe and a freely responding individual. On the one side there is the irresistibly imposed imagery—really, though we know it not, conditioned and instinctively moulded by our own organism—which stands for what in our waking hours we may term God and Nature; on the other side is the Soul struggling with all its might, and very inefficient means, against the awful powers that oppose it. The problem of the waking world is presented over again in this battle between the dreaming protagonist and his dreamed fate. Both of these elements are instinctively reasoned out, consciously or subconsciously; both are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

imperfect fragments from the rich reservoir of human personality. The things that happen to us in dreams, the pseudo-external world that is presented to sleeping consciousness—the imagery, that is, that floats before the mental eye of sleep—are a perpetual source of astonishment and argument to the dreamer. A large part of dreaming activity is concerned with the attempt to explain and reason out the phenomena we thus encounter, to construct a theory of them, or to determine the attitude which we ought to take up with regard to them. Most dreams will furnish evidence of this reasoning process.

Thus, to take a commonplace example, a lady dreamed that she was visiting an acquaintance who wished to send a small sum of money to a person in Ireland. She rashly offered to take it over to Ireland. On arriving home she began to repent of her promise, as the weather was extremely wild and cold. She began, however, to make preparations for dressing warmly, and went to consult an Irish friend, who said she would have to be floated over to Ireland tightly packed in a crab-basket. On returning home she fully discussed the matter with her husband, who thought it would be folly to undertake such a journey, and she finally relinquished it, with great relief. In this dream—the elements of which could all be accounted for—the association between sending money and the post-office, which would at once occur to waking consciousness, was closed; consciousness was a prey to such suggestions as reached it, but on the basis of these suggestions it reasoned and concluded quite sagaciously.

Again (after looking at photographs of paintings and statuary, and also reading about the theatre), I dreamed that I was in a theatre and that the performers were acting and dancing in a more or less, in some cases completely, nude state, but with admirable propriety and grace, and very charming effect. At first I was extremely surprised at so remarkable an innovation; but then I reflected that the beginnings of such a movement must have long been in progress on the stage unknown to me, and I proceeded to rehearse the reasons which made such a movement desirable. On another occasion, I dreamed that I was in the large *plaza* of a Spanish city (Pamplona possibly furnishing the elements of the picture), and that the Governor emerged from his residence facing the square and began talking in English to the subordinate officials who were waiting to receive him. The real

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reason why he talked English was of course the simple one that he spoke the language native to the dreamer. But in my dream I was extremely puzzled why he should speak English. I looked carefully into his face to assure myself that he was not really English, and I finally concluded that he was speaking English in order not to be understood by the bystanders. Once more, I dreamed that I was looking at an architectural drawing of a steeple, of quite original design, somewhat in the shape of a cross, but very elongated. I attempted in my dream to account for this elongation and concluded that it was intended to neutralize the foreshortening caused when the steeple would be looked at from below.

There is, we here see afresh, a fundamental split in dreaming intelligence. On the one side there is the subconscious yet often highly intelligent combination of imagery along rational although often bizarre lines. On the other side is concentrated the conscious intelligence of the dreamer, struggling to comprehend and explain the problems offered by the pseudo-external imagery thus presented to it. One might almost say that in dreams subconscious intelligence is playing a game with conscious intelligence, offering it problems, and bidding it guess the solution. So that in the world of dreams, it may be said, we see over again the process which, James Hinton was accustomed to say, we see in the universe of our waking life: God or Nature playing with Man, compelling him to join in a game of hide-and-seek, and setting him problems which he must solve as best he can. It may well be, one may add, that the dream process furnishes the key to the metaphysical and even indeed the physical problems of our waking thoughts, and that the puzzles of the universe are questions that we ourselves unconsciously invent for ourselves to solve.

We can never go behind the fantastic universe of our dreams. The validity of that universe is for dreaming consciousness unassailable. We may try to understand it and explain it, but we can never deny it, any more than we can deny the universe of our waking life, however we may attempt to analyze it. Dreaming consciousness never realizes that the universe that confronts it springs from the same source as itself springs. I dreamed that a man was looking at his own house from a distance and on the balcony he saw his daughter and a man by her side. "Who is that man flirting with my daughter?" he asked. He produced a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

field-glass, and on looking through it he exclaimed: "Good Heavens! it's myself!" Dreaming consciousness accepted this situation with perfect equanimity and solemnity. In the dream world there is indeed nothing else to do. We may puzzle over the facts presented to us; we may try to explain them; but it would be futile to deny them, even when they involve the possibility of a man being in two places at the same time.*

Only to a few people there comes occasionally in dreams a dim realization of the unreality of the experience. "After all, it does not matter," they are able to say to themselves with more or less conviction. "This is only a dream." Thus one lady, dreaming that she is trying to kill three large snakes by stamping on them, wonders, while still dreaming, what it signifies to dream of snakes; and another lady, when she dreams that she is in any unpleasant position—about to be shot, for instance—often says to herself: "Never mind, I shall wake before it happens."

This duality of dreaming consciousness is a manifestation, and the chief one, of what is called *dissociation*. In dissociation we have a phenomenon which runs through the whole of the dreaming life and is scarcely less fundamental than the process of fusion by which the imagery is built up. The fact that the reasoning of dreams is usually bad, is due partly to the absence of memory elements that would be present to waking consciousness, and partly to the absence of sensory elements to check the false reasoning which without them appears to us conclusive. That is to say, there is a process of dissociation, by which ordinary channels of association are temporarily blocked through exhaustion of the nervous elements, and the conditions prepared for the formation of the hallucination. It is, as Paris has argued, in sleep, and in those sleep-resembling states called hypnagogic, that a condition of dissociation leading to hallucination is most apt to occur.

* A somewhat similar mistaken self-detachment may even occur momentarily in the waking condition. Thus Jastrow ("The Subconscious," p. 137) refers to the "lapse of consciousness" of a lady student, who, while absorbed in her work, heard outside the door the shuffling of rubber heels such as she herself wore, and said, "There goes ——," naming herself. That delusion was no doubt due to the eruption of a dream-like state of distraction. As regards the visual phantasm of the self (which has sometimes been seen by men of very distinguished intellectual power), it may be noted that it is favored by the conditions of dream life. Our dream imagery is all pictural, sometimes even to dream consciousness, and to see oneself in the picture is, therefore, not so very much more remarkable than it is in waking life to come upon oneself among a bundle of photographs.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus it is that though the psychic frontier of the sleeping state is more extended than that of the normal waking state, the focus of sleeping consciousness is more contracted than that of waking consciousness. In other words, while facts are liable to drift from a very wide psychic distance under our dreaming attention, we cannot direct the search-light of that attention at will over so wide a field as when we are awake. We deal with fewer psychic elements, though those elements are drawn from a wider field.

The psychology of "attention" is, indeed, a very disputed matter. There is no agreement as to whether it is central or peripheral, motor or sensory. According to the convenient distinction established by Ribot, there are two kinds of attention: *voluntary* attention and *spontaneous* attention, the first being artificial and acquired, a product of human evolution, and the second emotional and primitive, common to animals and children. Spontaneous attention is persistent during sleep, but voluntary attention is at a minimum. In some such way, it seems, whatever theory of attention we adopt, we have to recognize that in dreams the power of attention is limited.

Such a position is fortified by the conclusion of those who look at the problem not so much in terms of attention as in terms of apperception. Apperception, according to Wundt, differs from perception in that while the latter is the appearance of a content in consciousness, the former is its reception into the state of attention. Or, as Stout defines it, apperception is "the process by which a mental system appropriates a new element, or otherwise receives a fresh determination." Apperception is, therefore, the final stage of attention, and ultimately, as Wundt remarks, it is one with will. Apperception and will, as most psychologists consider, like attention, are enfeebled and diminished, if not abolished, in sleep.

In dreams, it thus comes about, we accept the facts presented to us—that is the fundamental assumption of dream life—and we argue about those "facts" with the help of all the mental resources which are at our disposal, only those resources are frequently inadequate. Sometimes they are startlingly inadequate, to such an extent, indeed, that we are unaware of possibilities which would be the very first to suggest themselves to waking consciousness. Thus the lady who wished to send money to Ireland is not aware of the existence of postal orders, and when she



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

decides to carry the money herself she is not aware of the existence of boat-trains, or even of boats; she might have been living in palæolithic times. She discusses the question in a clear and logical manner with the resources at her disposal and reaches a rational conclusion, but considerations which would be the first to occur to waking consciousness are at the moment absent from sleeping consciousness; whole mental tracts have been dissociated, switched off from communication with consciousness; they are "asleep" even to sleeping consciousness.*

The result is that we are not only dominated by the suggestion of our visions, but we are unable adequately to appreciate and criticise the situations which are presented to us. We instinctively continue to reason, and to reason clearly and logically with the material at our disposal, but our reasoning is hopelessly absurd. We perceive in dreams, but we do not apperceive; we cannot, that is to say, test and sift the new experience and co-ordinate it adequately with the whole body of our acquired mental possessions. The phenomena of dreaming furnish a delightful illustration of the fact that reasoning, in its rough form, is only the crudest and most elementary form of intellectual operation, and that the finer forms of thinking involve much more than logic. "All the thinking in the world," as Goethe puts it, "will not lead us to thought."

HAVELOCK ELLIS.

* A very similar state of things occurs in some forms of insanity, especially in the less profound states of mental confusion, when, as Bolton remarks, we find "certain associated remnants of former experience combined into a sequence according to the normal laws of mental association."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THE PUBLIC LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES.

BY MORRIS BIEN.

COMPARATIVELY few people are acquainted with the development of our public-land policy. How we began with the idea of disposing of the lands in large blocks for cash or its equivalent, in order to meet the expenses of the Revolutionary war and other governmental needs; and how we gradually reached the policy of so disposing of the lands, as to encourage settlement and home-making.

The official history of this process is to be found in many hundred official reports and thousands of statutes, from special laws granting certain individuals a few hundred acres to encourage the establishment of a ferry, to a great public statute like the homestead law under which nearly 80,000,000 acres of land have been patented, passing for the most part to actual settlers and home-builders.

Among the numerous reports on the public lands none is more comprehensive or reliable than the "Public Domain" which was prepared in 1880-83 by a commission appointed by Congress. From this report has been taken much of the statistical information given in this paper.

The public lands of the United States were acquired in various ways. By the Articles of Confederation, agreed to in Congress November 15th, 1777, and ratified by the several States in the four subsequent years, the Government of the United States of America was organized and pursuant to that act took possession and control of the unappropriated crown lands of Great Britain, as the successor of that Government. By the definitive treaty of peace, concluded September 3rd, 1783, Great Britain formally relinquished all its "propriety" (proprietary) and territorial

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rights, leaving the ownership of the United States and of the several States undisputed.

During the existence of the Government under the Articles of Confederation, Congress on September 6th, 1780, passed a resolution recommending the surrender and cession by the several States of their waste and unappropriated lands, to aid in paying the public debt incurred by the war of the Revolution. These lands lay to the west of the present boundaries of the States.

New York, Virginia, Massachusetts, Connecticut (in part) and South Carolina, in the order named, complied with this resolution and ceded their western lands to the United States prior to the organization of the Government under the Constitution in 1789. The lands of North Carolina and Georgia, and the remainder of the western lands of Connecticut were ceded afterward. The cost of the Georgia cession was $6,200,000. Texas ceded a large area outside its present limits on November 25th, 1850, which cost $16,000,000.

The other public lands were acquired by treaty and purchase: The Louisiana Purchase from France, April 30th, 1803; Florida from Spain, February 22nd, 1819; the southern half of the area west of the Rio Grande and the Rocky Mountains from Mexico, February 2nd, 1848, and December 30th, 1853; Alaska from Russia, March 30th, 1867.

There has been some discussion as to the origin of our title to what was known as the Oregon country, comprising the States of Oregon, Washington and Idaho, and the portions of Montana and Wyoming west of the Rocky Mountains. The question was whether our title was derived from the Louisiana Purchase or directly by discovery and prior possession. As the result of a discussion by the General Land Office in 1898, the map of the United States now issued by that office states that the title was established in 1846. The exact basis of our claim has apparently never been authoritatively decided.

The controversy with Great Britain regarding the northern boundary west of the Rocky Mountains was practically settled by the treaty of June 15th, 1846, except as to the extreme western end at its junction with the Pacific Ocean. The treaty of May 8th, 1871, provided, among other matters, that the decision of this point should be left to the Emperor of Germany, who decided in favor of the contentions of the United States, October

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

21st, 1872. Thus a period of nearly ninety years elapsed from the treaty of peace at the close of the Revolution before the location of the northern boundary was definitely settled.

The total area of the acquisitions by State cessions was about 500,000 square miles, or about 320,000,000 acres, at a cost of $22,200,000. The area acquired from foreign Governments, including the Oregon country, was about 2,400,000 square miles, or about 1,500,000,000 acres, at a cost of $65,957,389.98.

In addition to these costs, which include interest and settlement of private claims to 1880, the United States has paid more than $200,000,000 for extinguishing the rights of the Indians to these lands.

The Territory of Hawaii, acquired by treaty July 7th, 1898, and the cession of Porto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines from Spain, December 10th, 1898, do not fall within the limits of this discussion, as the disposition of the public lands therein (except in Guam) has been placed by Congress in the local governments. The payment for the Spanish cession was $20,000,000.

In forming new States from the territory obtained through these cessions from States and foreign Governments, Congress has required each new State to adopt an irrevocable ordinance that the State shall not tax the public lands nor pass laws to interfere with the primary disposal thereof by the United States.

The public lands of the United States were, in the beginning, regarded as an asset for the payment of the debt incurred in carrying on the war of the Revolution. Many plans for disposing of the lands were proposed and considered.

The earliest efforts were to sell the land in large blocks, and prior to the organization of our present Government Congress made three such sales.

The first was the sale to the Ohio Company. This was originally intended to cover two million acres at one dollar per acre, the land lying in the present State of Ohio on the Scioto and Ohio rivers. The area was reduced to 822,900 acres, and the sale was confirmed July 27th, 1787. The amount actually received was two-thirds of a dollar per acre, and payment was made in certificates of the public debt.

The second sale was to John Cleves Symmes, finally confirmed by the Act of May 5th, 1792. The lands lie in the present State of Ohio on the Ohio River, between the Great and Little Miami

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rivers, near the site of Cincinnati. The tract was supposed to contain one million acres, but its actual area was 248,540 acres. This was sold at the same rate of two-thirds of a dollar, paid in certificates of the public debt and military land warrants.

The third sale was to the State of Pennsylvania, a tract now in Erie County, containing 202,187 acres. This was sold at the same rate, and paid likewise in certificates and military land warrants.

By the Act of March 2nd, 1799, those who had made contracts with Symmes for lands not lying within his purchase, as finally determined, were allowed to buy the lands contracted for at two dollars per acre, payable in certificates of the public debt. About 88,880 acres were sold under this law.

Practically the first Act of general character for the sale of lands was passed May 18th, 1796, and related to a tract in the present State of Ohio. This provided for a system of rectangular surveys substantially as now in use. Townships were laid off six miles square containing thirty-six sections, each being one mile square, and having an area of 640 acres. Alternate townships were to be subdivided into sections, while only the exterior boundaries of the others were laid out on the ground.

The subdivided townships were to be sold in tracts not less than one section, or 640 acres each. The other townships were to be sold in tracts not less than a quarter township, excluding the four middle sections which were reserved for future disposal, making blocks of eight sections each. Thus these lands were to be disposed of in tracts of 640 acres and 5,120 acres, respectively.

The sales were to be made to the highest bidder at a public sale, but no sale was to be made for less than two dollars per acre. One-half was to be paid within thirty days, and of this one-tenth was required at the time of sale, with one year's credit for the remaining half. The land was forfeited in case of failure to pay the balance. A discount of ten per cent. was allowed on one-half the amount, if the whole sum were paid within thirty days.

By the Act of March 3rd, 1797, passed the next year, the lands sold after that date could be paid for in evidences of the public debt.

The Act of 1796 remained in force for four years without pro

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ducing very satisfactory results, only 121,540 acres having been disposed of.

The total area sold prior to the Act of May 10th, 1800, was 1,484,047 acres for $1,201,725.68, an average price of less than eighty-one cents per acre. This includes some small tracts sold before the organization of our present Government at the minimum prices of one dollar, and two-thirds of a dollar.

The Act of 1796 established the office of Surveyor-General with substantially the same duties as that officer now exercises. The sales were made under the supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury. The smaller tracts were sold under the direction of the Governor or Secretary of the Western territory and the Surveyor-General at Cincinnati or Pittsburg according to districts defined by the Act. The quarter-township tracts were sold by the Secretary of the Treasury at Philadelphia, then the seat of Government.

The Act of May 10th, 1800, made further provision for the sale of lands in the present State of Ohio, modifying in several important particulars the Act of 1796.

Four land districts were designated each under the administration of a Register and a "Receiver of Public Monies" with substantially the same functions as at present. Their offices were established at Cincinnati, Chilicothe, Marietta, and Steubenville. Provision was also made for a Receiver at Pittsburg. Thus by 1800 there had been established substantially our present system of the surveys of the public lands under the supervision of a Surveyor-General for a specified district, and a system of sale by a Register for each land district, not necessarily the same as the Surveyor-General's district, and the receipt and accounting for funds by a Receiver of Public Moneys for each district. New land offices were opened and new offices of Surveyor-General were established from time to time as they became necessary.

Under the Act of 1800 the lands were offered at public sale in sections and half-sections for not less than two dollars per acre, payable in cash or in evidences of the public debt. One-fourth of the price was to be paid within forty days, one-fifth of that, or one-twentieth of the whole, was required at the time of sale. The other three-quarters were payable in two, three and four years, respectively, with interest at six per cent. per annum. A discount of eight per cent. per annum was allowed for advance

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

payments. Provision was made for forfeiture and resale in case of default. The lands remaining unsold after having been offered for sale could be purchased at private sale for two dollars an acre.

The Surveyor-General was authorized to lease the lands reserved for future disposition, in sections and half-sections, for terms not exceeding seven years. The Act also provides that any person who has erected or has begun to erect a grist-mill or sawmill upon the lands to be sold was "entitled to the pre-emption" or preference right, to purchase the section on which it was located at two dollars per acre.

Before 1789 deeds for the lands sold were executed by the Board of Treasury, corresponding to our present Treasury Department, or by the loan commissioners, agents of this board. After that date all patents for the lands sold were executed by the President, countersigned by the Secretary of State, and recorded in his office. It is to be noted that in a few cases, Congress had made grants of lands in such terms that patent was not required, title passing directly by virtue of the Act.

By the Act of April 25th, 1812, the General Land Office was established in the Department of the Treasury. To this office were transferred all the duties relating to the survey, sale, and patenting of the public lands previously performed by the Secretary of War and the Secretary and Register of the Treasury.

All patents for lands were to be issued in the name of the United States under the seal of the new office, signed by the President and countersigned by the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

To relieve the President of the great burden of personally signing the large number of patents issued, Congress, by Act of July 4th, 1836, authorized the President to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a secretary whose duty it would be to sign land patents in his name. This statute continued in effect until July 19th, 1878, when the President was authorized to designate an executive clerk to perform this duty, instead of submitting a nomination for confirmation by the Senate.

The General Land Office became part of the Department of the Interior when the latter was organized, March 3rd, 1849.

After the Act of 1800 the sales of public lands continued without material change in system but with gradual improvements in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

detail. As each new area was opened to sale, the existing system was extended to it providing for sale at public auction with the right of purchase at private sale after the period of public offering, usually three weeks, part payment in cash and the balance in four years.

Prior to the Act of March 26th, 1804, the lands were offered for sale in not less than half-sections (320 acres). By that Act the survey and sale of lands in quarter-sections (160 acres) was authorized. Before that time payment of surveying expenses and patent fees had been required, but was discontinued by that Act.

Payments for lands in evidences of the public debt were authorized by all the general land laws until the passage of the Act of March 3rd, 1803, which provided that in the purchase of the lands in Mississippi Territory, being the lands lying south of the State of Tennessee, such payments could not be made. The Act of April 18th, 1806, discontinued such payments as to all public lands thereafter sold.

The Act of April 24th, 1820, made a radical change, however, requiring immediate payment in full for all sales made from and after July 1st, 1820. The credit system had been demoralizing. Congress had been constantly importuned to extend the time for payment, and acts for this purpose were passed at nearly every session. The privileges of these acts were limited to persons who had purchased not more than 640 acres. After 1820 such Acts were passed nearly every year until the passage of the Act of May 23rd, 1828, which provided for the issue of certificates to represent the money paid for land which had reverted to the United States because of failure to complete the payments. These certificates were receivable in payment on the purchase of other lands within the same State or Territory.

This Act was followed by the Act of March 31st, 1830, and the Act of July 9th, 1832, providing for further relief in such cases, closing the long series of enactments for the relief of credit purchasers.

The total amount of land sold under the credit system was about 19,400,000 acres for about $47,700,000. This was scaled down by the operation of legislation, by reversions and by relinquishments to about 13,600,000 acres, and the receipts were about $27,900,000, an average of a little more than two dollars per acre.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Act of April 24th, 1820, made other important changes than requiring cash payments. It provided that from and after July 1st, 1820, all public lands should be offered for sale in half-quarter sections, or eighty-acre tracts. This had not been previously permitted except in six designated sections of each township, authorized by the Act of February 22nd, 1817. When disposed of at private sale the purchaser had the option of buying as much as a section (640 acres). The Act of 1820 also fixed the minimum price, whether at public or private sale, as $1.25 per acre. The Act also provided that public sales should be kept open for two weeks.

By the Act of April 5th, 1832, the sale of quarter-quarter sections, or forty-acre tracts, was authorized.

In pursuance of the early policy for the sale of the public lands in large blocks every effort was made to prevent settlement on the lands prior to purchase.

June 15th, 1785, Congress, under the Articles of Confederation, passed a resolution forbidding settlement on the public domain. Other warnings were given in various ways. The Act of March 3rd, 1807, prohibited such settlements under penalty of forfeiting any right or claim that the settler may have, and the President was authorized to use the civil and military forces to remove such persons from the lands. An exception was made in favor of settlers prior to the passage of the Act who, upon application to the local land office, could obtain permission to occupy the lands as tenants at will, but must remove from them when a sale was made.

March 25th, 1816, a similar privilege of temporary occupation on application was given to all who had settled upon public lands prior to February 1st, 1816. The right to make such application was to continue for one year from the date of the Act. March 3rd, 1817, Congress extended this time to March 3rd, 1818, and on April 20th for another year.

Meanwhile the difficulty of preventing settlement prior to sale, and the gradual abandonment of the idea of obtaining a large revenue from the sale of the lands, due no doubt to the increasing prosperity of the nation, induced the policy of encouraging settlement and home-making upon the public lands. Pre-emption entries based upon settlement were accordingly authorized from time to time for certain specified areas.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The first right of pre-emption or preference right was given by the Act of March 2nd, 1799, in favor of those who had made contracts with Symmes or his associates for lands which were not included in the area patented to them. This right was not based upon settlement, and the Act of May 10th, 1800, was the first to give such a right based upon occupation of the land, namely, to those who had erected or had begun to erect a grist-mill or a sawmill in the Ohio country before the passage of the Act.

From time to time Acts were passed providing for pre-emption rights within certain areas and subject to varying conditions. By 1830 a large part of the public land was comprehended within the operation of these Acts.

On May 29th, 1830, the first pre-emption Act of general application was passed, allowing entry by those who had settled on the land before that date and remaining in force for one year.

April 5th, 1832, "all actual settlers, being housekeepers upon the public lands," were allowed the right to enter, within six months after the passage of the Act, a tract not exceeding eighty acres, to include their improvements. By various subsequent enactments these provisions were continued in force until the passage of the general pre-emption Act of September 4th, 1841.

This Act provides that "every person being the head of a family, or widow, or single man, over the age of twenty-one years, and being a citizen of the United States, or having filed his declaration to become a citizen," who since June 1st, 1840, has made, or shall thereafter make settlement in person on surveyed public land and shall live upon and improve the same, may enter not exceeding 160 acres at the minimum price of $1.25 per acre. No person was entitled to make more than one such entry, nor could any one make such entry who was the owner of 320 acres of land.

In 1853 and 1854 the right of pre-emption on unsurveyed lands was extended to a number of the States and afterwards by the Act of June 2nd, 1862, to all unsurveyed public land.

The passage of the pre-emption Act and the change in sentiment regarding the public lands rendered less important the early system of disposing of the lands at public sale.

Soon after the passage of the pre-emption Act, the Commissioner of the General Land Office was, by the Act of August 3rd,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1846, authorized to offer for sale isolated or disconnected tracts which had not previously been offered without the formality and expense of a proclamation by the President, which had previously been required.

In the course of time the practice of disposing of lands at public sale gradually died out, and now such sales take place only for isolated tracts and in certain other exceptional cases.

From August 14th, 1854, to June 2nd, 1862, there was in force a law providing for a modification in the price of lands taken under the pre-emption Acts known as the Graduation Act. Its purpose was to reduce the price of the public lands to actual settlers and cultivators. The price of all lands which shall have been in the market for ten years or upwards was fixed at one dollar per acre, when this period had reached fifteen years the price was reduced to seventy-five cents per acre, and so on, by graduation of twenty-five cents for each five years till the period had reached thirty years, after which the price was twelve and one-half cents.

The pre-emption law remained in force until March 3rd, 1891, when it was repealed.

The feeling that the public lands should be retained for home-makers acquired more and more strength, until in 1852 it became a national political issue. In that year the Free Soil Democracy incorporated in its platform for the Presidential campaign this declaration:

> "That the public lands of the United States belong to the people, and should not be sold to individuals nor granted to corporations, but should be held as a sacred trust for the benefit of the people, and should be granted in limited quantities, free of cost, to landless settlers."

This question held the public attention, was discussed and debated and remained a political issue before the people for ten years.

A homestead bill was passed by the House of Representatives in 1859, but after being voted on by the Senate several times failed to pass.

In June, 1860, after much discussion in both Houses, a homestead bill was agreed upon and presented to President Buchanan, who on June 23rd, 1860, vetoed the bill.

The provisions of the bill may be summarized as follows:

Any citizen of the United States who is the head of a family,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and any person of foreign birth residing in the country who has declared his intention to become a citizen, may enter and settle upon not exceeding one hundred and sixty acres of public land, and, after residing upon it for five years, shall receive patent for the land.

The bill also contained a cession to the States of all public lands within their limits which remain unsold after having been subject to sale for thirty years.

The veto message states that the proposed cessions to the States would involve a present donation to them of 12,229,731 acres and would from time to time transfer to them other large bodies of land.

President Buchanan stated a number of objections to the bill. His principal point was that the bill was unconstitutional because it made a donation of the public lands to the States and to individuals, holding that the power given by the Constitution to dispose of the public lands did not include the power to give them away. The President objected because of the injustice to the early settlers who had braved the hardships and dangers of frontier life and had paid $1.25 per acre for their lands; also because it would depreciate the value of the land warrants of old soldiers, which were given for their services in fighting the battles of their country.

An effort was made in the Senate to pass the bill over the veto, but the necessary two-thirds vote in its favor could not be obtained.

In the political campaign of that year the free-homestead law was an important feature of the discussions of Lincoln and the other candidates.

Soon after the opening of the extra session called by President Lincoln to convene July 4th, 1861, on account of the troubled conditions in the South, a new homestead bill was introduced in the House of Representatives on July 8th, and it was promptly taken up at the opening of the regular session in December. There was vigorous opposition, and the bill did not pass the House of Representatives till February 28th, 1862. The bill was amended in the Senate and passed by that body on May 5th. The two Houses soon after agreed upon a form of bill, and it was finally passed by both Houses on May 19th and approved by President Lincoln on May 20th, 1862.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Act as passed differs in only one important particular from the bill which was vetoed, namely, in the omission of the proposed cession of lands to the States.

The homestead law has now been on the statute-books for nearly fifty years, substantially as originally enacted. It is regarded as the basis of our land laws and was the most successful of our land policies. The constitutionality of the Act does not seem to have been seriously questioned in the courts.

As settlement pushed Westward it became evident that a very large part of the public domain was arid or semi-arid, and that new agricultural conditions must be met by legislation.

The first attempt was by means of special legislation passed March 3rd, 1875, for the sale of desert lands in Lassen County, California, in tracts of 640 acres, at a price of $1.25 per acre. The land was to be reclaimed by conducting water thereon within two years.

This Act was a departure from the policy of the homestead Act in two features: first, in not requiring residence on the land and, second, in allowing an individual to take four times the limit of area fixed in the homestead law.

March 3rd, 1877, the Desert Land Act was passed and applied to practically all the States and Territories in which desert land is found. The principal difference from the former Act was in allowing three years for reclamation instead of two.

The Act of August 30th, 1890, limited the amount of land which any one could acquire under any or all the public-land laws to 320 acres, which, of course, limited desert-land entries to 320 acres. This limitation is still in force. The Act of March 3rd, 1891, provided more in detail as to the requirements of reclamation and demanded, for three years, annual proof of an expenditure of one dollar per acre in the reclamation of the land and in permament improvements thereon, but patent could be obtained in less than three years upon proving an expenditure of three dollars per acre; the entryman was also required to cultivate one-eighth of the land.

The lack of residence requirement and the ease with which proof of expenditure could be obtained opened the way for much fraud under this Act, and the amount of land permanently improved under it is disappointingly small.

The opportunities for irrigating lands on a scale which could

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be handled by a few individuals were comparatively few; and experience showed that irrigation companies which did not also own or control the land to be irrigated were seldom financially successful.

Congress has not been willing to give individuals or corporations control of large areas as was necessary for the success of the more extensive and costly irrigation enterprises. The limit of individual development was soon reached, however, and some new plan became necessary.

On March 20th, 1888, Congress had authorized a thorough study of the water-supply of the Western States where irrigation is needed, and on October 2nd of that year made an appropriation for the selection of reservoir sites which, when designated by the Director of the Geological Survey, were to be held reserved until further action of Congress. The following year another appropriation was made for continuing the work; after that no further appropriation was made. The reservoir sites which had been reserved, numbering several hundred, are still to some extent available for use by the Reclamation Service, although some have been taken by private parties under the general Act of February 26th, 1897.

The general Act of March 3rd, 1891, providing for right-of-way over the public lands for ditches and reservoirs for irrigation purposes, was the outgrowth of the Irrigation Survey.

August 18th, 1894, Congress passed what is known as the Carey Act which provides for turning over to the desert-land States any lands which they may irrigate or cause to be irrigated. The amount is limited for each State and Territory to one million acres with an extension recently made to two million acres each for Idaho and Wyoming.

The usual plan is for the State or Territory to make a contract with a corporation by which the latter is to build the works and may make certain charges for the water right, the State selling the lands at a nominal price.

This plan did not, however, meet some of the more difficult conditions, and on June 17th, 1902, Congress went a step further, completing the policy initiated by the Irrigation Survey of 1888-90, and appropriated the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the arid and semi-arid States for the construction of irrigation works. Under this Act the Reclamation Service was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organized and has constructed a number of large irrigation systems and has now under irrigation nearly one million acres of land. The cost of construction is repaid by the water-users; and these repayments, together with the annual receipts from the sales of public land, constitute a revolving fund to be used indefinitely in continuing this work.

There is a large portion of the public lands which would be arable but which will never be irrigated either because there is not sufficient water-supply or because the physical conditions make it impracticable to bring water to the land.

A considerable area is valuable for grazing purposes, and for some years there has been an effort to secure a comprehensive system for permitting the use of such land, in the large areas necessary for their proper utilization, under suitable regulations.

By the Act of April 28th, 1904, homestead entries of 640 acres were allowed in a certain portion of Western Nebraska, presumably for the purpose of encouraging small cattle farms. Strong efforts were made to secure a 640-acre homestead law for other areas, but thus far without success.

A 320-acre homestead law applicable to the greater part of the arid region was passed February 19th, 1909, for the purpose of encouraging settlement on non-irrigable land, assuming that the entryman would be able to support himself by raising crops by the so-called "dry-farming" methods and by cattle-raising on a small scale. The "dry-farming" methods of raising certain crops in the arid region without the artificial application of water have been successful in certain localities and under certain conditions. We must await the results developed by this Act before we can determine whether it meets the situation.

The problems presented in regard to the grazing areas are difficult, and the more logical method of treatment requires a complete classification of the public lands to determine the grazing areas and a comprehensive study of the conditions, upon which could be based a systematic method of dealing with them.

This completes a review of the laws concerning the settlement and disposal of public lands for agricultural purposes. The laws regarding the disposition of mineral lands, coal, timber and stone lands, are not directly connected with the subject of this paper and do not involve so great an acreage. The lands disposed of by donations for military and other services, grants to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

railroads and grants to States for various internal improvements, involve a large area, and the history of the laws concerning them forms a chapter by itself. There have also been very large grants to States for educational institutions and for various administrative purposes.

The following table compiled from the report of the Public Lands Commission appointed by ex-President Roosevelt shows the principal methods in which the public lands have passed from the ownership of the United States, and the status of the lands remaining, brought down to June 30th, 1904:

DISPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC LANDS.

| *Purpose.* | *Acres.* |
|---|---|
| Private land claims, donations, etc | 33,400,000 |
| Wagon-road, canal and river improvement grants | 9,700,000 |
| Railroad grants | 117,600,000 |
| Swamp-land grants | 65,700,000 |
| School grants to States | 69,000,000 |
| Other grants to States | 21,600,000 |
| Military and naval land warrants | 61,000,000 |
| Scrip issued for various purposes | 9,300,000 |
| Allotments to individual Indians | 15,100,000 |
| Mineral lands | 1,700,000 |
| Homestead entries | 96,500,000 |
| Timber-culture entries | 9,700,000 |
| Timber and stone entries | 7,600,000 |
| Cash entries, including entries under the pre-emption desert and other acts | 276,600,000 |
| Rights-of-way | 300,000 |
| Forest reserves | 57,900,000 |
| Reserved for public purposes | 6,700,000 |
| Indian reservations | 73,000,000 |
| Entries pending | 39,500,000 |
| Unappropriated public land | 837,639,840 |
| Total (including Alaska) | 1,809,539,840 |

The latest report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office shows that the area of unappropriated public land (including Alaska) on June 30th, 1909, was 731,354,081 acres.

The tendency of our land policies has been toward the principle that home-making upon small areas should be encouraged and that the disposition of tracts in excess of 160 acres to each individual should be allowed only upon special terms of improvement as in the desert-land Act and the new 320-acre homestead Act. In any event, no person may acquire through the public-land laws more than 320 acres.

Under the Reclamation Act the special opportunities afforded by irrigation have caused Congress to authorize the limitation of



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

entries to areas ranging from 10 acres to 160 acres, depending upon the amount which the Secretary of the Interior finds to be required for the support of a family.

The history of our public lands and the policy applied to their disposition divides itself into three distinct periods.

The first period is characterized by the desire to dispose of the land in large tracts and to secure as great and rapid a return as practicable.

In the second period the desire for return becomes less important, and the encouragement of settlement is the main feature.

In the third period the proceeds of the sales of the lands is entirely subordinated, and the main desire is to secure the establishment of homes on comparatively small tracts.

These lines of policy have been worked out with comparatively few backward steps, and the present tendency favors the homestead idea. The important present problem, however, is the policy to be adopted in regard to the large tracts suitable for grazing and not suitable for subdivision into small tracts for homes.

The present trend is apparently toward the establishment of small cattle farms to be held by individuals. Whether this can be worked out in practice remains to be seen. If this should not be successful the general opinion seems to favor the leasing of the grazing lands in comparatively large areas under suitable regulations, the public retaining the title indefinitely.

The future development of the public-land policy will probably be guided more directly by scientific study of the lands and their possibilities than has heretofore been the case, which leads to the certainty that the ultimate solution will be for the best interests of the public.

MORRIS BIEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN ITALY.

## A REJOINDER.

BY ARCHBISHOP IRELAND.

My article in the North American Review of July, "The Methodist Episcopal Church in Italy," has been honored by a reply in the August number from the pen of the Rev. S. M. Vernon, D.D. A rejoinder is, I believe, in order. It will be brief. The question, "The Methodist Episcopal Church in Italy," is not so important to the general public that a discussion of it be allowed to task overmuch the pages of the North American Review: nor, indeed, has the good Doctor given room for anything else than the briefest kind of a rejoinder. Not one of the charges I made has he seen fit to answer: not one of my statements with regard to the methods put into vogue by Methodism in Italy has he striven to disprove. The whole article, from first to last, is beside the question — an *ignorantia elenchi,* as logicians would say—an attempt to mislead the reader through a belabored evasion of the point at issue. Charges had been made with full bills of particulars. Has Dr. Vernon taken direct hold of one single charge, to strip it of semblance of credibility, or otherwise show it to be inapt or irrelevant? Not he, indeed. The charges —he hides them from view in clouds of vague and captious verbiage, or totally brushes them aside, substituting in their stead new questions, better fitted, he may think, to his pen, but altogether alien to the controversy in hand. Dr. Vernon's tactics are those of the skilled sophist: they win victory if the sophistry into which they are woven is not detected and exposed.

By the way, Dr. Vernon leaps into the arena a free lance, unsummoned, unauthorized by the Board of Bishops, to whom my

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

article in the July number of the REVIEW was addressed. Why the reply has not come from the Bishops, I do not divine. Dr. Vernon seemingly invites them to speak: he says: "In so far as the venerable prelate refers to the expression from the Board of Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church concerning Methodism in Italy, I shall not follow him, leaving an answer on those points to the discretion of those to whom the matter belongs." Dr. Vernon is known as one ever ready to break a lance with the Catholic Church: I willingly accept him as my antagonist, provided, however, that coming into the place properly belonging to the Board of Bishops he take up the case exactly as it is between them and me, facing straight the issue, as it has been made, without turn to right or to left.

The methods pursued by the Methodist Episcopal Church in Italy—this the issue. The Board of Bishops made loud proclamation of "the moral integrity" of those methods, and challenged opponents to give "details of specific acts" supposed to justify a contrary estimate. In response, I enumerated, in abundant wealth, "details of specific acts" to which, I maintained and still do maintain, there attached no shadow of moral integrity. Was I or was I not correct in my statements of "specific acts"? This the question to be answered by him who would give reply to my article: this the question to which Dr. Vernon has not replied.

My statements as to the methods made use of by the Methodist Church in Italy remain, I contend, firm and unimpaired, one and all, unshaken, even in a single instance, by arrow or spear from the pages of Dr. Vernon's article.

I am entitled to dismiss at once, as irrelevant and biasing the question, the latter half of Dr. Vernon's article—his references to the Inquisition, to illiteracy in Italy, to indulgences and relics, to supposed miracles in Bethlehem and Jerusalem, to alleged conditions, moral and religious, in the Philippines, Cuba and Porto Rico or in Italy itself. What, I ask, have all such references to do with the issue—the methods of the Methodist Church in Italy? Let things be as bad as Dr. Vernon is willing to imagine among Catholics in one country or in another, yesterday or to-day—will this change into righteousness the unrighteous doings of other people, Methodists or non-Methodists? Dr. Vernon must remember that we have just one issue before us: until my state-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments are proven or disproven, the rules of logic forbid racing over new fields, lest the main topic be lost sight of.

I confess it is under severe pressure of self-restraint that I do not at once take up the several matters which Dr. Vernon, in spite of their irrelevancy, drags into the controversy, in order that, whatever his failure to extricate from their straits his co-religionists of Italy, he may in retiring from the arena allow himself the satisfaction of thinking he has at least imprinted a few black marks on the face of Catholicism. It were so easy to sift his anti-Catholic allegations into misinformations, misrepresentations, misapplications of facts to principles, of practices to theories. Glad, indeed, I shall be, so soon as we are through with Methodism in Italy, to discuss with the good Doctor, whenever and wherever it be pleasing to him, the several matters he now brings up against the Catholic Church, or such other matters as he may choose—with the sole restriction that it be one thing at a time.

Misinformations, misrepresentations—even now I must note a few samples—giving as such those of his strictures upon Italy which, in his saying, made imperative the coming of Methodism into Italy.

Before the arrival of Methodism, according to Dr. Vernon, "the Bible was excluded from Rome." Only one excuse may be offered for this outrageous violation of the truth: to Dr. Vernon's mind, the Bible is not the Bible unless dressed up in Methodist binding. Before the arrival of Methodism, very likely the Methodist version of the Bible, whichever that be, had no admission into Rome: but the Bible, known to Christian ages, was in Italy in all the languages of the learned, and no less in that of the common people. Will Dr. Vernon dare tell us that before the arrival of Methodism the "Vulgate," translated into Italian by Monsignor Martini, was not in circulation in Rome and elsewhere in Italy—was not offered for sale in every book-store in the Peninsula? The Bible, in the language of the people, not in circulation in Rome and elsewhere in Italy before the arrival of Methodism! In 1778, the Pope, Pius VI, prefacing with his blessing an edition of the Bible in Italian, wrote to the translator: "You judge exceedingly well that the faithful should be excited to the reading of the Holy Scriptures." In 1858 the publishing-house of the Congregation of the Propaganda put

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forth, at a price of fifteen lire (three dollars), a splendid edition of the Martini Bible in twenty-three volumes, and later printed several popular editions, to be sold at smallest cost. Let Dr. Vernon question the bookstores, surviving in Rome from olden days, those of Saraceni, Martinetti, etc., and learn whether, long before the arrival of Methodism, they were not accustomed to have on their counters the Bible in Italian, in all forms, at all prices. Those the open facts: and yet, in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, Dr. Vernon writes that before the arrival of Methodism "the Bible was excluded from Rome." Wonders do not cease!

Again: according to Dr. Vernon, before the arrival of Methodism there was in Italy "the almost entire suspension of the preaching of the Gospel in the Roman Catholic churches of that unfortunate country." I pass by the doleful epithet "unfortunate": Dr. Vernon, in applying it to Italy, only means that the country was outside the Methodist fold. In response to his allegations as to the suspension of the preaching of the Gospel, I need for the moment do no more than ask Dr. Vernon to glance through the volumes of printed sermons from some of the more famed preachers who were filling Italian pulpits while Methodism was meditating its entrance into Italy—Ventura, Alimonda, Belzofirere, Stocchi, etc., etc., and then bid him say whether or not the Gospel, in its fulness, was not being preached in the Catholic churches of Italy?

And again: according to Dr. Vernon, "the last census of Italy says that of all the States of Europe Italy has the largest number of men without any religious profession!" Now the last census of Italy says nothing of the kind: it makes no comparisons between Italy and other States of Europe. The census simply says that in a population of 35,000,000 there were registered as having no religion 23,315—an insignificant figure. It is for Dr. Vernon to quote the religious census reports of other States of Europe, and, if he chooses to do so, as far as it is possible, the religious census report of the United States, and then tell us in exact figures how Italy fares in unreligion in comparison with other nations. I doubt whether Dr. Vernon has ever seen the official figures of that last census of Italy, upon which, nevertheless, he bases his arraignment of that country for religious unbelief. Equally exact is he, no doubt, in his special reference to the city of Rome. "It is undoubtedly true," the Doctor says,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"that Rome itself—contains in its borders more sceptics and infidels than any city of its size in the world." Proof should be given of this charge.

I pass to the several subterfuges, through which my venerable antagonist fain would escape my statements of "specific acts," marked as worthy of censure in the methods of the Methodist Italian propaganda.

Away with Everett S. Stackpole! Says the distinguished Doctor Vernon: "The Archbishop displays a fatal weakness in the foundation (Dr. Stackpole) upon which he chooses to build." But with or without Dr. Stackpole, other stones there are in the foundation, upon which to raise a giant structure of insults and misrepresentations, of calumny, fraud and venality. There still remain Bishop William Burt, the "*Cenni Storici,*" the "*Evangelista,*" friend and ally of the "*Asino.*" I refer the reader to my quotations from those uncontroverted "authorities."

But must I let go of Dr. Stackpole? According to Dr. Vernon, Dr. Stackpole has never been recognized as a Methodist "authority" by any other being than Archbishop Ireland; instead of being a Methodist "authority" he is repudiated by all Methodist authorities as unfair and unjust to the mission. Dr. Vernon's play on the word "authority" enlivens the controversy; I pass it by. That the book—"Four and One-Half Years in the Italy Mission"—is an injury to the mission, I readily grant; that it is unfair, I steadfastly deny. Nor does its subtitle—"A Criticism of Missionary Methods"—put an *a priori* censure upon its contents. Criticism comes from friend as well as from foe; it is doled out reluctantly or willingly. Dr. Stackpole's "Criticism" was given with deep regret—only for truth's sake—and throughout he is most friendly to the mission, its purposes and labors—censuring "the methods" only with a view to their amendment. It is convenient to repudiate Dr. Stackpole, when through dint of sincerity and love of truth he has offended his Methodist friends. A repudiation of him was not quite so easy before his book had been written, when, with might and main, he was working to plant Methodism in Italy. At one time "The Christian Advocate" had said of him: "Dr. Stackpole's sincerity is so manifest that his faith is contagious and full of inspiration." Praise most exuberant had been lavished upon him by such "Methodist authorities" as Bishop J. H. Vincent, Professor John

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

S. Sewall and Rev. Daniel Steele. While in Florence, in 1891, President of the Theological School, he received a visit of a week's duration from Bishop Vincent; and the Bishop under his own signature gave, in the "New Christian Advocate," a pen-picture of the host. The Bishop writes: "Dr. Stackpole, who is an intense believer in the most intense type of Methodism and a loving disciple of the devout Daniel Steele, labors most faithfully to promote the spiritual life, to train the heart and conscience. He endeavors to interpret the most practical and experimental portions of the Scriptures, in the every-day chapel service and in the students' class-meeting on Saturday nights. One of the most refreshing religious meetings I have attended for years was this same Saturday-night class." A rather reliable "Methodist authority," this Dr. Stackpole, if we confide in Bishop Vincent. Nor with Bishop Vincent's certificate of good character before me shall I believe that Dr. Stackpole was cut short in his work and ingloriously removed from Italy by the Bishops of the American Episcopal Church, unless other proof than the word of Dr. Vernon, spoken in the heat of controversy, be forthcoming. To what extent the book, "Four and One-half Years," is to be taken as a "report" the declaration of Dr. Stackpole explains: "We have tried during our stay in the Italy mission and in the preparation of this book to fulfil the duty to which we were called and to give the Church the benefit of one more intelligent American judgment as to plans and methods of work in evangelization among Roman Catholics." To those words Dr. Stackpole adds the following: "The reader must judge whether the criticisms herein contained are hasty and judicious. The statements of facts can easily be confirmed by abundance of testimony." Dr. Stackpole's statements are so plain, so open to investigation, that, if false, they can be upset with the turn of the hand. Let Dr. Vernon grapple with one single statement and prove it unworthy of belief: then shall we allow him to repudiate his colleague as an "authority" unworthy of credence. An objection brought by Dr. Vernon against "Four and One-half Years" might, at first sight, have had some weight had it not been most graciously forestalled by the Board of Bishops. The book was written sixteen years ago. But the date matters not. The Bishops tell us that the methods of the mission in Italy "are the same to-day that have been pursued from the beginning." No; the leopard

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has not changed his skin: Methodism in Italy is to-day as bad as it was yesterday—to-day, under its guiding star, the Rev. Mr. Tipple, somewhat worse, more bold and more offensive.

As an offset to my list of disreputable men, ex-Waldensians and ex-Catholics, chosen by the Methodist Church as its theological students and preachers, Dr. Vernon names five converts to Methodism who, he vouches, were not only above reproach, but were eminent in learning and in virtue, whether before their conversion or later during their ministry as apostles of their new faith. Of those one was converted from Waldensianism; four from Catholicism. I give the record of one of those famed "converts," Count Enrico di Campello. Di Campello was a canon of St. Peter's in Rome. Unbridled ambition and intolerable levity of conduct brought to him serious and repeated admonitions from superiors. He turned Methodist and was at once inducted into the Methodist pulpit. He aimed for high proselytism, but failed ingloriously. Soon he had done with Methodism. In 1904, he begged for readmission to the Catholic Church. After three months of penitential exercises in the Spanish-American College, he made public abjuration of Methodism with every sign of deep sorrow and firm purpose of amendment. Reconverted to Catholicism, he wrote a "Statement of Methodism in Italy"—another "Four and One-half Years." I commend the "Statement" to Dr. Vernon: it mercilessly shatters the aureole which the "Conversion" of Di Campello was supposed to have woven around the brow of Methodism. Verily Dr. Vernon is rash in his gift to Methodism of sages and heroes: more and more plain it is that he writes of Italy with scant information of Italian happenings.

If bad men from Catholicism were on hand to be picked up from Catholicism, what, Dr. Vernon asks, but Catholicism had made them bad? Were the inference true, what defence is there in it for Methodism? If men are bad, whatever the cause, does Methodism establish "the moral integrity" of its methods by taking them to its bosom and exhibiting them as apostles of a "pure Gospel"? Strange logic, this of Dr. Vernon! But no; they were not made bad by Catholicism. They became bad in Catholicism despite Catholicism, and being bad they were rejected from Catholicism, or conscious of the uncongeniality of its atmosphere, they rushed from it of their own accord. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cleanest garden occasionally grows weeds: honor to the garden that casts the weeds across the wall: shame and disgrace to the neighboring bit of soil to which they are welcomed.

The Pope, we are jocosely told, should have paid no attention to a cartoon in the "*Evangelista*," cartoons being "a harmless way of expressing one's feelings towards those who have the presumption to hold religious opinions that cannot be approved." I do not imagine that the Pope lost much sleep over cartoons in the "*Evangelista*" or in its congener, the "*Asino*": the Vatican ramparts are too stoutly built to yield a breach to anxiety under pailfuls of mud. Yet the Pope, a gentleman, if nothing more, should not be expected to accept as gentlemen the throwers, or to open to them as friends the gateways of his palace. "Unjust attack," Dr. Vernon says, "is the good man's opportunity and often his richest asset." Perfectly true—in the present instance, it is an honor to the Pope that his enemies are the editors of the "*Evangelista*" and of the "*Asino*." Again: "The epithets hurled at Jesus Christ called forth some of His best utterances." Perfectly true—as, for instance, when the Master, whip in hand, chased the money-changers from the temple or hailed the Pharisees and the Sadducees as "a brood of vipers."

I copied from the "*Nazione*" of Florence a list of books bearing repulsive titles, exhibited in the window fronts of the Methodist bookstores in Rome. But, retorts Dr. Vernon, the writer had not looked into the contents: he had not opened or read the books. Singular remark, this! The title promises unclean contents: therefore, the clean man must forthwith investigate the contents. "I suppose," says Dr. Vernon, "the Methodist bookstore in Rome, like the Methodist bookstores in this country, does a general book business, buying and selling according to the demands of trade within such limits as seem proper for a religious bookstore." Verily, does not Dr. Vernon place on a low level the moral standard of Methodist booksellers and Methodist book-readers both in Rome and in America? He is correct, I admit, as to Methodists in Rome; not so, I love to believe, as to Methodists in America. I know of no Methodist bookstore in America that would challenge the attention of passers-by with such unhealthy bait as "*Le Infamie dei Papi*," "*Le Lordure dei Pontifici*."

Writing of my comments on Methodist schools in Rome, Dr.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vernon shows a too cursory reading of those comments. They were not based upon gossip I had gathered up while loitering around "a female school." Dr. Vernon is decidedly funny: I have no time, no disposition to follow suit. My comments were based mainly upon official reports of those schools, as, for instance, the reports of the directresses of the Crandon Institute and of the Isabella Clark Refuge. Those directresses advertise their Institutes as "respecting the religious convictions of all"; they confess that the parents of their pupils earnestly object to sectarian teaching: yet they unblushingly boast of being able to train, on the quiet, the children intrusted to them into dalliance with Methodist doctrines and Methodist hymn-singing. Fraud and treachery! And the mention of my uncontroverted comments wrests from Dr. Vernon's lips an approving smile! By the way, stress is laid by Dr. Vernon on the fact that the grandchildren of "the old patriot," Garibaldi, were educated in Methodist schools, and that a Signora Garibaldi is to-day the directress of the Isabella Clark Refuge. Small gain to Methodist proselytism: the mother of Garibaldi's grandchildren is an Englishwoman, a Protestant from her earliest years.

I had said the purpose of Methodism in Italy is to proselytize Catholics, to assail "Popery" in its citadel. So had said Bishop Walden; so had said the "*Cenni Storici,*" one of the official Methodist publications; so had said the whole Methodist propaganda in loud words and in louder attempts at deeds; and so had said Italian public opinion, as far as it took notice of the propaganda. Not so, replies Dr. Vernon, quoting a communication from Professor E. C. Riley to the "Central Christian Advocate": "It is not true that the Methodist Church is guilty of insulting agitation and offensive proselytism which constitutes a real warfare against the Holy Father and the Catholic religion. The Methodists have their hands more than full with those who come to them believing nothing and seeking light." No warfare, no insulting agitation! Professor Riley had not read the "*Cenni Storici,*" the "*Evangelista*": nor had he heard the echoes of Dr. Tipple's wild harangues. "The Methodists have their hands more than full with those who come to them believing nothing and seeking light!" Hollowest of hollow boastings! Why, then, has not Methodism shown significant results from its forty years' propaganda? Why the need of padded "reports," and of loans

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of hearers from other Protestant congregations to deceive visiting elders? Why souper-fashion payments in money and kind to the "*contadini*" of country village and the miserable residents of back street and alleyway in cities that they come now and then to shout in concert a Methodist hymn? Either Dr. Riley and Dr. Vernon write of things they wot not of, or they are consciously bent on throwing dust into the eyes of unsuspecting readers.

I have rehearsed, I think, all of Dr. Vernon's flutterings, by which he hoped to fill twelve pages of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, without for once touching upon the point at issue—the "details of specific acts" upon which I based my charges against "the moral integrity" of the Methodist propaganda in Italy. It is, perhaps, clever of him—to say so much without saying the thing needed to be said. But is it honest, straightforward logic?

The details of "specific acts" remain uncontroverted. The methods of the Methodist propaganda in Italy are—calumny and misrepresentation, fraud and deceit, padded reports, the luring of the poor by traitorous gifts—vapid boastings of success where failure is patent, opprobrious abuse of the Catholic Church and its Supreme Pontiff, avowed alliances with lawbreakers and anarchists. Those the methods with which a "pure Gospel" is introduced into Italy, by which the citadel on the Vatican hill is to be smashed into ruin! Well, there is a God in Israel. It is the honor of the Catholic Church that such methods as those put into vogue by Methodism had to be made use of in attacking it. Truth, spoken in calmness of mind, in loveliness of heart, it was felt, would not avail.

Efforts at self-expansion are legitimate in any organization; to preach its tenets is a right none will deny to any Church that believes it has a mission to humanity. But the methods by which self-expansion is sought must be such as to be approved of by God and by man. Dr. Vernon says the Paulist Fathers are propagandists of Catholicism: so they are; so are all priests and loyal servants of the Catholic Church. But I challenge Dr. Vernon to discover in Catholic propagandism a semblance, however vapory, of the methods of Italian Methodism. The American Board of Methodist Bishops once so forgot themselves as to write: "We now content ourselves with affirming the moral integrity of our missionaries and methods in Italy." The Bishops were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

removed too far from the scenes they attempted to depict: they did not, we believe, know what was going on in Italy. The padded reports and the lurid messages of their missionaries written for the purpose of winning, *per fas et nefas,* smiles and money, had blinded them to the actual facts. The actual facts are now before them to be seen and pondered over.

As an American I protest against the Italian Methodist propaganda. The Methodist Church is installed in Italy as an American institution: it gives itself as the religion of America: it floats over its buildings the flag of America: it wraps around its doings the names and the prestige of America, as if all that is great and good in America were pre-eminently embodied in Methodism, as if, indeed, all that is great and good in America pre-eminently had its life spring in Methodism. The purpose is patent: it is to gain for Methodism a hearing under the cover of the flag of America, under the spell of the prestige of America. Meanwhile America suffers: its fair name is bound up with the fraud and deceit that constitute the stock in trade of the Methodist propaganda. Unjust all this to America: unjust all this to Americans, Catholics and non-Methodist Protestants. In America there is no State Church: no Church has the right to sail over foreign seas as the particular representative of America. Besides the Catholic, there are in America other Churches, loyal to America as was never John Wesley, possessed of equal rights, endowed with equal privileges: those Churches do not mean to be excluded from the map of America when abroad it is asked—which is the Church of America?

But why do I discuss before the public the methods of Methodism in Italy? Why not as Dr. Vernon advises—advising me to do with regard to things Methodist what it is not his wont to do with regard to things Catholic—quietly notify "the authorities of the Church" of the matters complained of, leaving to them to bring remedy as discretion might dictate? Judging from the temper of mind of the Board of Bishops evidenced in their pronouncement of May 19th, the prospect was slight that heed were to be given by "the authorities of the Church" to warnings and expostulations. What, however, is more to the point, so far as Catholics are concerned—the public discussion of Methodism in Italy was forced upon them. Respect for its dignity, a due sense of its responsibility as guardian of Catholic faith and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

morals compelled the authorities of the Vatican to adopt certain rules in the granting of Papal audiences. Thereon the cry went out of Papal intolerance, Papal mediævalism, Papal obscurantism. The Papacy had again proved itself—this time beyond redemption—to be the everlasting enemy of liberty! Catholics in America were told that they were brought to bay either to repudiate the Papacy or to confess themselves traitors to American institutions. On the tongue of the Rev. Mr. Tipple, the agent of Methodism in Rome, the question against the Papacy had lifted itself to an international plane: the nations must rise in their might and rebuke the Vatican. Meanwhile Italian Methodists were guileless, innocent victims, mistreated for the Gospel purity of their preachings, the dove-like methods of their Christian apostolate! The Pope was the wrong-doer: with him political motives ruled supreme: the Methodist propaganda had been made his footstool in his quarrel with the Quirinal! Were the spiritual sons and soldiers of the Papacy to remain silent, to speak no word of defence in its behalf? It was too much to expect: they were in duty bound to speak: they have spoken.

JOHN IRELAND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# AMERICAN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST.

BY BRITANNICUS.

THE course of American policy in the Far East has for many years been followed in Europe with a certain perplexity. That the United States has definitely enrolled the integrity of China and the principle of the open door among the objects of its diplomatic solicitude is by now pretty well understood. But how much weight is to be attached to this development is a question which Americans themselves, perhaps, could hardly answer with any precision and which European statesmen and publicists find frankly bewildering. The uncertainty is very largely due to the fact that nobody knows whether the diplomatic activities of the State Department represent a settled national policy or merely the views and whims of individual Secretaries of State. Mr. Hay, Mr. Root and Mr. Knox in the past twelve years have all formulated proposals and written despatches that seemed to commit the United States beyond escape to a leading rôle in the drama of Far-Eastern politics. Their countrymen to all appearances have applauded and supported them. It has, I should judge, sincerely gratified Americans to see their statesmen acquitting themselves with such distinction and success in competition with Oriental and European diplomats; and what one may call the sentimental sincerity of the American attachment to the open door I take to be beyond question. But diplomacy to be effective rests, and can only rest, on the implication of force. "If anything is to be done in the world," the Kaiser once declared, "the pen will be powerless to carry it through, unless backed by the might of the sword." Is American diplomacy in the Far East the diplomacy of the pen, or of the pen backed by the sword? Are Americans sufficiently interested in the fortunes of China or of Manchuria to contemplate the pos-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sibility of war? Is there any conceivable development in the Far-Eastern situation—short of an organized and deliberate attack upon American lives or possessions—that could induce American opinion to sanction the use of force? Does American diplomacy in the Far East belong to the sphere of *Real-politik,* or is it rather to be described as a series of more or less astute adventures in the art of bluffing? Is there not an unwritten mandate imposed upon Mr. Knox, as upon his predecessors, by the public sentiment of the United States—a mandate to the effect that he may spill ink, but must not think of spilling blood? All the world knows that America would rush to arms to punish or prevent a violation of the Monroe Doctrine. But although the Far East of recent years has been as much a preoccupation of American diplomacy as South America, can any one assert that it stands on a similar footing of actuality or that if, for instance, Japan were to close the door in Manchuria to-morrow Americans would feel irresistibly compelled to go to war? Another Boxer rising endangering the lives and properties of American residents in China, an invasion of the Philippines by an Oriental Power—in such contingencies as these American action could be predicted with every confidence. But apart from these extreme developments, and taking the Far-Eastern situation as it is to-day, is there anything in the effort to save Manchuria from drifting from its Chinese moorings and to prevent its political and commercial monopolization by Russia and Japan, or in the struggle for railway and mining concessions, of which not only Manchuria, but all Northern China, is to be once again the international battle-ground, or in the intricate political competition that is interwoven with the fight for trade, or in the "racial" issue or the naval issue, or in the prospect that Korea must pass finally, formally and completely into Japanese hands—is there anything in all this, or can anything be imagined as arising from all this, that American opinion would regard as a legitimate *casus belli?* The doubts that obtain under this head are the chief factor in the perplexity with which, as I began by saying, American diplomacy in the Far East is regarded in Europe. Nobody quite knows what fighting value, if any, should be attached to it, or whether Mr. Knox's prolific pen bears any correspondence to the material preparations or the national will power and determination that would be necessary to enforce the policies that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

flow from it. Is America in the Far East just amusing herself by playing at *Weltpolitik* or does she mean business? The objects of her diplomacy—to stave off the dismemberment of China and to preserve throughout the Far East an equality of commercial opportunity—are sufficiently clear. But how far is she ready to go to attain them? It is possible that even Americans are not yet in a position to answer that question with any definiteness. So far as an outsider can judge, they have not yet thought the matter out. In Europe, at any rate, among those who know the United States best, while American good-will is everywhere recognized as an asset of real value, the general opinion seems to be that Mr. Knox's diplomatic activities in the Far East are of a kind that can be countered and, if need be, resisted, without any serious risk of a more than verbal embroilment with the country he represents.

But while a readiness to fight is the ultimate touchstone of all diplomacy, and while a Power that shirks or overlooks the possibility of the final arbitrament of war is necessarily placed at an enormous disadvantage in the event of a real crisis, the ordinary business of international bargaining is carried on without much reference to the actual or potential power of the negotiators. The United States, through her character, the unselfishness of her aims and the moderation of her statesmen, has powerfully affected Far-Eastern developments during the past decade. Throughout the Boxer crisis Mr. Hay set the whole world a rare example of humane, pertinent and equitable diplomacy; he more than made up for the indifference and remissness of his predecessors in the State Department by taking a firm and definite stand in favor of the open door and the territorial integrity of the Celestial Empire; it was he who before the Russo-Japanese war did more than any other statesman to elucidate the realities of Russia's control over Manchuria; and it was through American intervention and on American soil that the Tsar and the Mikado concluded their treaty of peace. Up to the end of 1905, indeed, Europe was able to forecast American intentions and policies in the Far East with some exactitude. The United States was regarded as a Power which, itself indifferent to territorial aggrandizement at the expense of any Asiatic State, was resolved to protect China against partition, to insist on equal access to all the markets of the Far East, and to act as peacemaker among the nations. It



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was thoroughly in accordance with these aims that Mr. Roosevelt should have remitted to China a portion of the Boxer indemnity —a stroke of policy as shrewd as it was chivalrous—and that just before the last Presidential election the United States should have formally entered, by means of an agreement with Japan, into the league of international peace which had gradually formed round the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. But concurrently with these developments other tendencies began to appear in American policy. In the first place, the admiration for Japan, which had taken a practical financial form during her struggle with Russia, quickly gave way, when the war was over, to an attitude of suspicion and complaint. Japan, it appeared, got almost as much upon American nerves as Germany upon British nerves; and the Americans suddenly concluded that Hawaii and the Philippines, if not the Pacific coast itself, were in danger of a Japanese raid, that American traders were being shut out of Manchuria and Korea, and that Japanese ambitions, political, commercial and naval, would one day necessitate a war for the mastery of the Pacific. These apprehensions were all for a time brought to a head by the mannerless, if rational, prejudice of California against the admission of Japanese immigrants; and the relations between the two peoples, though not between the two Governments, took on a temporary but undoubted acerbity. Even to-day, when the immigration question is in process of settling itself, a sentiment of hostility in American thoughts about Japan is very evident, and all over the United States there appears to be an uneasy consciousness that the future is likely to increase rather than diminish the chances and causes of friction between the two nations. There can, at any rate, be little doubt that American diplomacy to-day has acquired an anti-Japanese point, and that, as compared with five years ago, the misgivings entertained by the United States in regard to Japanese aims and policy, and the estrangement which has set in between the two peoples, must be reckoned as new factors in the Far-Eastern situation.

In the second place, these misgivings and this estrangement seem to have embraced not only Japan, but Japan's ally, and to have affected to an appreciable extent the popular American attitude towards Great Britain. Americans apparently resent the Anglo-Japanese alliance as ministering to Japanese "arrogance,"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as an act, almost, of treachery to the white race, and as placing Great Britain in a highly equivocal and unsatisfactory position in the event of trouble between the United States and Japan. A dozen years ago the State Department at Washington cheerfully threw on Lord Salisbury's shoulders the burden of defending the open door. To-day Americans conceive the state of affairs to be precisely reversed. They believe that Great Britain allows herself to be overridden by her inexorable ally, that she looks on in fatuous and supine complacency while Manchuria is converted into a Russo-Japanese province, and that, so far from assisting, she positively thwarts the endeavors of the United States to make the open door a reality. Mr. Schiff's tirade of last March, in the course of which he impartially belabored Great Britain, Russia and Japan, was regarded in Europe as a visible sign that in the Far East Great Britain and the United States were at the parting of the ways. Since then the wrangle over the Hankau-Szechuan loan and Great Britain's prompt rejection of Mr. Knox's scheme for the internationalization of the Manchurian railways have served to confirm the American belief that the Anglo-Japanese alliance means the sterilization of British policy and the abdication of British enterprise in the Far East. So far as I can judge, I do not think it is putting it too strongly to assert that a portion, at any rate, of the distrust and resentment with which Americans have watched the course of Japanese policy since the war falls upon Great Britain; that the State Department at Washington no longer counts upon Downing Street as an auxiliary in the struggle for the open door; that so far as American diplomacy is opposed to Japan, it is opposed also to the Anglo-Japanese alliance; and that the masses of Americans, whenever their attention is called to Far-Eastern affairs, find fresh confirmation for their suspicion that Great Britain is not "playing the game."

The third factor to alter the position of affairs since the Russo-Japanese war is the steady growth of American friendship with China—a friendship that Europe, with equal cynicism and ignorance, diagnoses as the resultant of the famous Chinese boycott of American goods. As the only Power whose interests on the Asiatic mainland are purely commercial, the United States has always stood high in Chinese regard; but to-day it is not too much to say that the Celestial Empire leans almost exclusively

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on American support, and recognizes in the United States her best guide and well-wisher. If she has any champion at all in her efforts to maintain her sovereignty over Manchuria intact, that champion is America. If she has in the whole world a single sincere friend who would gladly see her strong, united and progressive, that friend is America. It is from America that China will receive the ablest and most disinterested assistance in converting herself into a modern State, just as it is from America that she has already received the most persistent encouragement in her campaign against opium. To direct Chinese advancement from the abundance of her own experience in matters of education, government and commerce, to be the tutelary genius of that vast, nerveless, disjointed but aspiring Empire, and to protect her by a vigilant diplomacy from the encroachments of her powerful neighbors—such is the high rôle to which America, more or less unconsciously, seems destined to be called. Side by side, at any rate, with American alienation from Japan there has proceeded an American *rapprochement* with China; and no European statesman doubts to-day that it is one of the objects of American diplomacy in the Far East to guard China and befriend her, to play her off as much as possible against Russia, Great Britain and Japan, and to reap a legitimate reward in a harvest of railway, mining and industrial concessions.

The three factors I have enumerated as forming the new American policy in the Far East—namely, a scarcely veiled antagonism to Japan, a suspiciousness both of Great Britain's attitude and of her effectiveness in regard to the open door, and an increasing intimacy and confidence in Chino-American relations —have to be reinforced by two other factors of not less weight and consequence. The first is the formal adoption by the American Government in the Far East, as in South America, of the German plan of pushing private trade by every artifice of official and diplomatic assistance. Mr. Taft's endorsement of this device has been often proclaimed, and his insistence upon American participation in the Hankau-Szechuan loan proved that he meant what he said and was determined to act upon it. So long as he is in the White House, and probably for much longer, one may, therefore, take it for granted that American financiers, contractors and concession-hunters and merchants in the Far East will enjoy the resolute backing of their Government, and that all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the knowledge and helpfulness possessed by an alert and highly trained consular and diplomatic service will be placed freely at their disposal. This is a development of very considerable moment because the motive power behind at least three-fifths of the international rivalries over China and Manchuria is the competition for trade. But of equal or even greater importance in shaping the course of American diplomacy at this juncture is the fact that the State Department is presided over by Mr. Knox. In place of the insight and imagination and the unvarying courtesy of Mr. Hay, and of the lucid, patient intelligence of Mr. Root, the world has now to reckon with Mr. Knox. The world, or, at any rate, the world of European diplomacy, has not, I am bound to confess, found the change at all to its taste. In his handling of both South-American and Far-Eastern affairs, Mr. Knox, to the surprise of all who remember him as a grave Constitutional lawyer, has shown a tendency to revert to the hectoring tone and the half-baked impulses that characterized the diplomacy of Mr. Blaine and Mr. Sherman as markedly as they did not characterize the diplomacy of Mr. Hay and Mr. Root. Although he has only been in office for some eighteen months, it is safe to say he has made more mistakes and occasioned more unnecessary and futile trouble than could be charged against his two predecessors during a whole decade. From the Crane episode to the squabble with Russia over the taxation imposed on American citizens by the Russian Railway Company at Kharbin, and onwards to his egregious proposals for the neutralization of the Manchurian railways, Mr. Knox has not once intervened in Far-Eastern affairs without receiving a rebuff, and exposing himself and his country to the laughter and amazement of the world.

The supreme instance of his heedlessness or incapacity was to be found, of course, in his astounding scheme for internationalizing the Manchurian railways. Feeling apparently that the various pledges and conventions that purport to regulate the status of Manchuria were hardly worth the paper they were written on, that Japan was exploiting Southern and Russia Northern Manchuria as though Chinese sovereignty were no more than a convenient fiction, that the door which it was promised should remain open had, in fact, been effectually closed on the outside world, that all forms of development to which Russia and Japan

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

objected had to be abandoned, that Great Britain was indifferent and China helpless and that Manchuria was rapidly lapsing into a Russo-Japanese preserve, Mr. Knox suggested that the Manchurian railways should be neutralized by sale to China, that the operation should be financed by the five leading Powers, and that the management of the lines should be placed under joint international control. In this way alone, argued Mr. Knox, could equality of commercial opportunity be guaranteed beyond question and Manchuria saved from becoming the cockpit of an international struggle for concessions and privileges. As a matter of mere theory, every one, I think, will agree that it would be better for the tranquillity of the Far East if Manchuria could be taken out of politics. But every one also must recognize that of all the dreams that ever beguiled the fancy of statesmanship this one is surely the least likely of realization, and that its first contact with the realities of the situation would shatter it to pieces. What are those realities? They are, first, that Russia and Japan but a few years ago waged the most terrible war of modern times, largely for the control of the railroad built by Russia under the Chinese concession of 1896; that by the Treaty of Portsmouth that control was divided between them, Russia retaining the northern section in her own hands and ceding the southern portion between Changchun and Port Arthur to Japan; and that since then both Powers have given abundant evidence of the importance they attach to the settlement thus obtained. Mr. Knox's proposals, therefore, while of interest to all Powers with a commercial or political stake in the Far East, peculiarly concerned Russia and Japan. Yet the American Secretary of State omitted to sound either Government in advance before springing his scheme upon the world. Without a moment's warning he launched a programme that contravened not only the Treaty of Portsmouth, but also the Convention with Japan by which the United States bound herself to observe the *status quo* that Mr. Knox now proposed to upset. That in itself was sufficiently startling. But the full inanity of Mr. Knox's adventure could only be revealed by referring to the material issues affected by it. Russia since the war by an immense effort has double-tracked the Trans-Siberian line. Mr. Knox invited her to surrender her control over the Northern Manchurian section, a section some eight hundred miles long, forming the final and vital

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

link in the Russian chain of connections with the Pacific. Without that link Vladivostok is left in the air, the heart of Siberia, whither Russia is transplanting her surplus population at the rate of a million souls a year, is laid open, the Amur Valley and all the maritime provinces are held on sufferance, and the Russian advance across Asia ends in a fatuous *cul-de-sac.* To ask St. Petersburg, under such circumstances, to abandon her rights of ownership and administration in the Northern Manchurian railway was like asking Great Britain to neutralize the Channel Islands or the United States to renounce its interest in the Panama Canal. For other but not less compelling reasons Japan is and must be equally tenacious of her hold over the line from Changchun to Port Arthur; and the American suggestion that she should vest it in an international board ominously recalled to her the intervention of France, Russia and Germany which robbed her of the fruits of her victory over China. I need say nothing as to the financial aspects of Mr. Knox's scheme or of the probability of its adoption. It never stood a moment's chance of acceptance. It was courteously but summarily rejected by both Tokio and St. Petersburg, and their refusal even to discuss it necessarily carried with it the refusal of the British, French and German Foreign Offices. Even now, after six months of inquiry and reflection, the world has failed to discover a single intelligible principle behind Mr. Knox's *émeute.*

None the less, it has had one important result, a result that a foreseeing American Secretary of State would have done anything rather than help to bring about, a result that is hardly less disastrous to the purposes of American diplomacy than a defeat at sea. In the first week of July the text of a new Russo-Japanese Agreement was published. By the terms of this memorable compact Russia and Japan agree to co-operate in all that concerns the working of their respective railways in Manchuria and to refrain from all rivalry that would prevent the attainment of this object. Both Powers agree to maintain the *status quo* in Manchuria as it has been established by the Treaties and Agreements not only between Russia and Japan, but also—a far-reaching provision, this—between either of these Powers and China. Furthermore, in case anything occurs to endanger the *status quo* the contracting Powers bind themselves to discuss together the measures necessary for its maintenance. Now there were doubtless

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many influences at work to bring the antagonists of five years ago into the amicable relationship of which this new agreement is the proof. The recolonization of Manchuria by the Chinese, the absurdity of wasting time and energy on futile contentions over minor matters when both Russia and Japan had tacitly agreed not to renew the major struggle, and the necessity which Russia since the Balkan crisis of eighteen months ago has felt of concentrating in Europe—all this played its part in framing the Convention of July. But no one can doubt that Mr. Knox's proposals powerfully and, indeed, overwhelmingly contributed to the same end. Equally menacing the interests of Russia and Japan, they naturally predisposed those Powers towards concerted action.

I have tried in this article to elucidate the aims and motives of American policy in the Far East as they appear to a foreign and friendly onlooker. If I were to criticise them and to attempt an estimate of their relation to actual facts, I should have a great deal more to say. It would then, for instance, be necessary to show by irrefutable figures that the open door is not being violated in Manchuria by either Russia or Japan, that Great Britain is not by any means as weak or indolent in her Far-Eastern policy as she appears to be to Americans, and that most of the suspicions and apprehensions entertained by Americans are the product of imperfect information. That Manchuria is dominated throughout its length and breadth by Russia's and Japan's rights of ownership in the railways, and that the sheer force of economic pressure is slowly separating the province from China, is true enough. But only a miraculous transformation in the character and material organization of the Celestial Empire, or a war successfully waged against both Russia and Japan, can check the inevitable *dénouement*. The true policy for the United States is to avoid irritating where he cannot hurt and formulating proposals that it is impossible for her to carry out, to recognize that single-handed she can effect nothing, that Germany dare not and China cannot help her, and that her interests will best be served by a policy of cordial co-operation with the Powers in whose hands lies the decisive control of Far-Eastern events.

BRITANNICUS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

## ART.

One must affirm—it is difficult to say whether with more regret or pleasure—that Mr. Huneker offers us, in his "Promenades"* the best American book of contemporary art criticism. The book covers a wide field, sums up a great deal of information and expresses no little justness of opinion. The best of mid-century art is represented with some earlier work, Watteau's, Chardin's, the great Spaniard's and Botticelli's. Mr. Huneker has a temperamental fondness for the Spanish as for the eighteenth century in France. He has a highly cultivated taste for sick souls, unwholesome themes and scandalous characters. There are those who would not serve the devil if it were God's command. Botticelli, he means to do well by, but how can he when he so visibly hankers after the unction of Memling's virgins and openly sympathizes with those connoisseurs who find "evidences of a profounder and more naïve faith in the angular loveliness of the Flemish painters than in all the religious art of Italy and Spain"? It is something, however, to have the discussion of art conducted by one who knows the primitives as well as the *revoltés;* who is familiar with the Russian novelists and the rest of the uncomfortable Northern souls; who is as much at home in literature as art. The wide swathe makes the point of view likelier, the opinions weightier. The opinions here are strictly current opinions, but, as a rule, of the best current. The utter injustice to Manet is borrowed, along with much else, from last year's young French criticism. The difficulty is that with all his borrowing Mr. Huneker does not stop long enough to understand as, for example, where he falls foul of Mr. Berenson for asserting Velasquez's

* "Promenades of an Impressionist." By James Huneker. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

impersonality and of Mr. Ricketts for praising his distinction. Indeed, the whole passage on pages 110 and 111 is what we call in logic a *non sequitur*. It says, in effect, that Mr. Berenson should not have called Velasquez impersonal, because a critic of Spanish art asserts that Morelli's methods are unsound. Any one who understands Morelli's methods knows them to be as applicable to a painter's later manner as to his earlier and to our own day equally. Who has not walked through the annual Academy marking the pupils of Chase, the friends of Sargent? In respect of distinction, there again, as with impressionism, the word has a special significance and stands for a thing apart. If the author of this book does not recognize distinction when he sees it, so much the worse for him. It is quite possible to be a clever journalist and never once encounter it.

However, this book, with its wealth of biographical data, its candid reference to sound authority, is one the amateur cannot spare. It is amusing and more useful than excellent. For, when all is said and done, the book is prejudiced, flippant and sometimes vulgar—too vulgar for citation. It is full of *bon mots manqués*. As the jokes too often belong to a less delicate age than our own, so the epigrams are too often but wrestings from another man's wit, and the stories come in as *mal à propos* as those of the black-faced interlocutor at the end of the minstrel show. Often, indeed, they have the same brassy flavor. The style is harsh and ill tuned. The author translates, with utter nonchalance, whole passages at a time from French critics and sometimes neglects to translate. "The plucked music of a guitar" is candidly nonsense. The phrase "Goya *stems from* Caravaggio" is a violence to the English tongue, though the writer doubtless had in mind the German "*stammt her.*" "*Doublé de*" means lined with and should not come out as "Voltaire doubled by Rabelais"; nor is a red-chalk drawing a *sanguine; luxure* is not luxury; nor is *décor* decoration, but stage-setting; and *canopé* is a sofa and not a canopy, as the author fancies; and what is one to say to a writer who translates *l'anonyme, Gaddiano* as Anonyme Gaddiano? It is like Mr. Anon, who writes so many poems! The English is lax and slipshod throughout and falls down repeatedly in grammar and diction. Only trees, not men, are "umbrageous" safely. Slang cannot take the place of idiom, nor incoherence and loose constructions,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of style, and this the overworked journalists of to-day must learn again as they learned it once in the days of Lamb and Hazlitt. Otherwise we must set in a plea that our art criticisms shall not be written by our Sunday journalists.

---

It is a matter for great gratulation that Duret should be made accessible in translation. This book* is not so large as to be unwieldy, nor so dear as to be unpurchasable. It offers a large page that says a great deal, and about forty pictures that are surprisingly satisfactory. Modern reproduction, applied to the canvases of impressionists, simply does not reproduce. Too often it merely belies and belittles; at its best, as here, it can but faintly suggest. When the new method of painting is more firmly established; when a few generations have been brought up to see color as alone Manet, by special and divine gift, saw it, then some mechanical way will be devised to record such visual images.

This book furnishes an excellent and sober introduction to the theory of modern painting and the personality of the great Frenchmen of the generation just past. M. Duret knew them all. He sets Manet very high, higher than do most of the younger critics, and recognizes him as the master of them all and shows him in his habit as he lived; peace-loving, yet tempestuous; modest, but conspicuous; absorbed in the personal vision and yet inaugurator of a great movement.

The English of the translation is English and reads like fresh and living thought.

---

This last collection of critical essays by Camille Mauclair,† on modern painting, chiefly recent, and such allied arts as decoration, electric lights, stage-settings, sculpture, architecture in iron and the beauty of ironclads, is full of material for thought. The tradition of sound criticism remains unbroken in France; even while we in England have only special pleading and specious partisanship or mere irresponsible opinion, M. Mauclair is modern enough in feeling and attitude. He has been the friend, the historian, the apologist of the impressionists, these many

* "Manet and the French Impressionists." By Theodore Duret. Translated by J. E. Crawford Flitch, M.A. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1910.

† "*La Beauté des Formes.*" Par Camille Mauclair. Paris: Librarie Universelle, 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years, and he has that clearness and justness of vision which in any age we term classical; and this we assert even though he stands for Strauss's music and Sorolla's paintings.

We find him laying repeated stress on a serious, intellectual art, insisting on the reality of the categories "beautiful" and "ugly"; and again we note the admirable antithesis of "exact" and "true." To know that exactitude is something less, often something quite other than truth, to love beauty in its purity, to adhere as in the very title of his book to the beauty of forms as completely conceived and harmonized—this is to be in the main current of all the best that has been thought and felt in the world.

---

Mr. Carmichael* is one of those Englishmen who, like a canny lover, does not talk too much about his Italy. Now and then he prints a few desultory pages, which gives the sense of a pleasant, easy temperament as bland in its serene charm as the Tuscan air. It is easier to find those who praise Mr. Carmichael than to come at his books, yet nobody should miss his translation of "The Holy Converse of St. Francis with the Lady Poverty, His Own True Love." In this present volume he discusses the beginnings of the Immaculate Conception in Art, with a delightful pomp of learning and an impressive array of living scholars and ecclesiastics just indicated behind him; he takes a fall out of the seventeenth-century sort of thing for which Murillo set the fashion—the wax-doll creature with her eyes rolled up, her decorations like flowers of gems and muslin, her savor of stale scent. One could wish that while he was on the matter he had given an appendix to another curious presentation of the Blessed Virgin that occurs rarely indeed, but in one case at least, under the attribution of Pier di Cosimo, who painted one of the Immaculate Conceptions that Mr. Carmichael treats of—to that form of altarpiece in brief which can only be catalogued as a Virgin Annunciate, but which fits very ill that category; the Blessed Virgin stands between two saints in ecstatic adoration and the Dove is descending upon her. But the Angel Gabriel is away. Is this really an Annunciation in its symbolic aspect? Certainly it is not in any historical sense. Or is it a tentative presentation

* "Francia's Masterpiece." By Montgomery Carmichael. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of her as conceived Immaculate in the mind of God before time was? Some scholar and connoisseur must pronounce, and who so fit as Mr. Carmichael?

---

Sir Walter Armstrong* is a bold man and an impassioned. Only incredible courage could have let him undertake to compress all the art of three kingdoms into 312 small clearly printed, thickly illustrated pages; and let it be said hastily that they are admirable pages, every one, and that the arts are therein compressed. Only inconceivable passion could carry him through such superb claims for the race that he holds a brief for; and by the way, while he is all for the Celts, the British are very near his heart. It is not enough, though it is entirely Irish, to insist that Whistler's art was mainly British, in spite of his American birth, French training and anti-English pose. Nor is it enough to urge that English ivories may be distinguished by their having "more sobriety of conception and earnest simplicity of expression" than the Continent affords. (It is surely a slip of the pen which affirms on page 140 that the casket in the British Museum is not of ivory, but of the bone of the whale—"whale's bone" to our ancestors meant the walrus tooth.)

In England's behalf he likewise possesses himself of Meryon's art, though he writes the word quite wrongly with an accent. Charles Meryon got his name from an English father, but he got nothing else. He is Baudelaire's kin and Gérard de Nerval's. As soon might the Gothic of Notre Dame or Impressionist painting be handed over to the British Isles. The author flings in his net and all is fish that comes to him. "The art of wood-engraving may almost be claimed as an English invention—as practically in Italy and Germany it was a delicate mechanical process at the service of an art." This is midsummer madness! And to feel the admirable quality of the book many discounts must be made.

---

When some three or four years ago Mr. Berenson† finally published the long-awaited volume on the North Italian Painters, every one savoring to the full, its refined and penetrating addi-

* "Art in Great Britain and Ireland." By Sir Walter Armstrong. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.

† "A Sienese Painter of the Franciscan Legend." By Bernhard Berenson. New York: The John Lane Company, 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions to his theory of æsthetics was still unsatisfied and looked forward the more keenly to what should come next. That fourth volume on Italian Painting was only the close to the quartette of indispensable handbooks. Nowhere have sounder words been written on the æsthetics of painting than the series embodies—nowhere in English, perhaps, any so important. But they are too few. To express the principles is only a part of any demonstration; it remains as well to deduce the consequences, to illustrate and distinguish, to establish and amplify. When a man stands at his ripest hour, with his mind at its best and happiest, then he should offer his best and profoundest thought. The day of little books is past; the time of postscripts has not come. But still Mr. Berenson teases our expectations, and instead of his *magnum opus* reprints a little special study of a very minor painter. To be sure, this unassuming volume hides grave matter; not only does Mr. Berenson reconstruct exquisitely a charming figure that Mr. Langton Douglas discovered for us so few years ago, and reproduce lovely pictures that he himself discovered, he modifies and more than half unsays certain dogmatic utterances of ten or fifteen years ago on the supremacy of Florentine painting and the hopeless inferiority of line to mass. He would hardly, we may judge from this, again dismiss so cursorily the rare genius of Matteo di Giovanni and his mates and forerunners at Siena. And, furthermore, he now deliberately fills out an aspect that the handbooks had left untouched and supplements them superbly with the indication of all that he might discuss in a strictly religious art. Still, this is a mere hint, an adumbration. We caution Mr. Berenson not to dally too long before he offers the firm reality of the great book he owes his generation.

---

## FICTION.

In a charming old-fashioned poem a little girl who has been by night to watch the fairies at work reports that she saw "the drops of water made and the ears of the green corn fill." So one feels in reading "Celt and Saxon";* here one has a book in the making hewn out like Michael Angelo's last sculpture,

* "Celt and Saxon." By George Meredith. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910. (By courtesy of "The Forum" and Mr. Mitchell Kennerley.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but wanting yet the nicer chisel strokes from the great master's cunning hand. It is rather like meeting Richmond Roy in undress and looking at Diana Warwick in her bones. The novel is there, but not the style. It is not quite the same thing wanting the shifting lights, the dazzling, prismatic play of color and reflection; the divers colored web and the divers colored mind that we did not treasure enough when we had it.

To-day it seems like the unfinished window in Aladdin's palace. Not all the jewels of earth, nor all the earthly craftsmen can fulfil the rich commencement. There is a wealth of situation and a world of character. Patrick, who catches our keenest affection in the first sentence; his brother Philip, who is destined, we divine, to win it away from him; the princess with whom we are all in love, as aforetime with Amelia and Diana; the red-haired heiress who promises to capture us when Beauchamp's bride and Harry Richmond's had left us cold, and thereby to mark her creator's finest triumph over human nature in the cause of right reason—all these cross the stage and then vanish into thin air. Apart from the dramatic quality of the book, it is full of weighty matter, political and social. It is of to-day as completely as "Tono-Bungay" and much more vitally. What the "Egoist" did for man in the family, it promises to do for man in society. We are no longer at the first building of railways or at the Italian Resorgimento, splendid as such issues were; we are deep in the Irish question and organized charity and the problems of overgrown private wealth. We need sorely the wise counsels from a man wiser than his generation if for but two reasons: that he believed in the intangible and the impossible and kept his ear to the ground. Earth never counsels wrong to the fine ear! And what was Meredith's? From the very first chapter, when Patrick approaches the hills under a thunderous sky, there are bits of description as splendid as anything Richard saw or Carinthia Jane, where genius for a moment smelted the ore in the first heat. But more often the metal is not fused, lies all unready for working. The chapter on John Bull, for instance, sound in its wisdom, is tough of fibre and indigestible. Con's foolery wants aërating. Yet here and there the phrase flashes as of old, where, for example, Rodney hung "between gouty blood and luminous brain," or, "wore on his drawn eyelids and tightly drawn upper lip a look of lambent pugnacity,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

awake to the challenge, indifferent to the challenge and disdainful of the antagonist." With the wit goes the old-time ripe wisdom: "Women must take the fate of marketable fruit till they can earn their own pennies and then they'll regulate the market." There spoke out the friend of women candidly and kindly. Or, again, an ironic phrase is transcribed from the philosopher's notebook: "Degeneracy is the critical history of the arts."

Yet throughout the incompleteness of the work is felt, and it approves what many lovers of English have long believed, that Meredith's style is as proper to our genius as Virgil's to the Latin and is as excellent in kind. In this novel we have all of Meredith except what some have called the crabbed perversity and some the injudicious prodigality of his style. Lacking this, it seems somewhat of a wraith. There is a neat and comely mind which presents always an ordered loveliness, and its danger is that it may at times run thin. But there is a rich, big, gross sort of mind, splendid and terrible, declining sometimes upon bathos, mounting often to a pride of chase where it can attain and overlook the grand style. Its beauty "hath ever some strangeness in the proportion." Its danger is of clinging too close to clay, Antæus-like, or building up complications too intricate of "cycle on epicycle, orb on orb." Donne's genius was of this sort and so was Meredith's. If obscure it is that they are darkened with excess of light. It is the same Northern strain in the blood that banded the façades of Lombard churches with wild beasts, that carved the capitals of rock-based Benedictine abbeys with gross, grotesque and terrible imaginings, that poised the gargoyles to spy down upon cities from cathedral towers and set the drolleries of the *misereres* under every stall of the choir; this very strain determined Meredith's style, though the other part of him, the Celt, breathed pure fire into the mass, the breath of the finer spirit of life that taught him love and song and landscape.

Meredith's genius was akin to the green and fertile earth, with its rich yield of corn and wine, its capricious and wayward blossoms, its pebbly ways and russet briers. But still more was it like the wind, the cloud-dispeller, the tonic, "that bloweth where it listeth and thou hearest the sound thereof and knowest not whence it cometh nor whither it goeth—even so is every one that is born of the spirit."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED